

The Review of English Studies

VOL. V.—No. 20.

OCTOBER 1929.

FRESH SOURCES FOR MARLOWE

BY ETHEL SEATON

THE object of this article is primarily to point out Marlowe's indebtedness in certain places to a source not yet indicated by students of his plays, *i.e.* to Philippus Lonicerus, and through him to Giovanni Antonio Menavino, chroniclers of Turkish and Mediterranean history; and secondarily, to suggest that Marlowe's reading was much more extensive than he has hitherto been given credit for, even where it is not yet possible to draw definite parallels.

I. *Marlowe's Indebtedness to Lonicerus.*

(a) *Zoacum*.—It is remarkable that little curiosity seems to have been aroused by a word in *Tamburlaine*, Part II, l. 2941, which, as a queer foreign fish, has very naturally been thrown out of the net of the O.E.D. *Zoacum* looks at first sight as if it might rank with such odd and pungent words of its time as *stacte* or *guaiacum*. It is even more recondite than these, and more malodorous. Annotation of this name of the "baneful tree of hell," on the false fruit of which the damned feed, merely repeats (as does Dyce's note) the unsatisfactory comment of the 1826 edition of the plays: "*Zoacum* or *Zakkûm*. The description of this tree is taken from a fable in the Koran, chap. 37." Actually the fable is to be found in chapter 47, and, as William Bedwell, the Jacobean scholar of Arabic,¹ knew, the name of the tree is properly *ezecum*. Whence then did Marlowe derive his knowledge of the legend, and his more sonorous form of the name? The answer to this question widens our knowledge

¹ *The Arabian Trudgman*, 1615, sig. L 4^r.

of Marlowe's reading. Some years ago I had occasion to point out¹ that Marlowe could be seen to borrow almost verbally from a historical source. This led to the suspicion that he probably did so again elsewhere; and this has been proved to be so, with Zoacum as the clue.

The collection of various chronicles of Turkish affairs, made by Philippus Lonicerus in Latin, was first published at Frankfurt in folio in 1578 as *Chronicorum Turcicorum tomi duo*. In 1584 it was published in octavo, with some omissions and additions, and with changes in the arrangement of the books. In vol. i of each edition was included a Latin version of the *Cinque Libri de la Legge . . . de Turchi*, of Giovanni Antonio Menavino, published at Venice in 1548, and republished in an enlarged recension as *I Costumi et la Vita de Turchi*, Florence, 1551. Here, as Lib. I, Cap. XXIII, *Dell' anime, che, credono i Turchi, che saranno condannate nell' inferno*, is to be found the passage on Zoacum which appears in Lonicerus, Tom. I, Lib. II, Secunda Pars, Cap. XXIII, *De Animarum Damnatarum Poenis*, whence Marlowe borrowed it. It is possible to show that Lonicerus and not Menavino himself is Marlowe's source. Lonicerus asserts that he has made no changes in his original; this may be true as to substance, but he has permitted himself re-arrangement of individual passages, and of these the Zoacum passage is one. In the Italian of Menavino, as in the German translation of the *Legge* made by Heinrich Müller, which Lonicerus shows by a reference in the *Proemium* to his collection that he knew, the comparison of the fruit of the tree to devils' heads comes before the name of the tree. Lonicerus alters the order of the sentences, and it is the beginning and the end of his version that Marlowe, once he has started, follows thus line by line:

Now scaldes his soule in the Tartarian streames,
And feeds vpon the banefull tree of hell,
That zoacum, that fruit of bytternesse,
(Credunt præterea arborem, quam vocant Zoacum agacci, hoc est, amaritudinis.)

That in the midst of fire is ingraft,
(in medio inferni, licet igni quasi infixam.)
Yet flourisheth as Flora in her pride,
(florere.)

With apples like the heads of damned Feendes,
(cuius singula poma diabolorum capitibus sint similia.)
(Fructibus arboris istius damnati vescuntur, sperantes inde refrigerationem aliquam se percepturos. Verum non solum nihil inde refrigerationis percipiunt, sed amaro venenatoque sapore magis magisque excruciantur, gravioribusque inde mortis torminibus afficiuntur.)

¹ *Times Lit. Suppl.*, June 16, 1921, p. 388.

The Dyuels there in chaines of quenchlesse flame,
 (tum etiam diaboli ipsi ignitis eos catenis constrictos)
 Shall lead his soule through Orcus burning gulfe :
 From paine to paine, whose change shall never end.
 ((ne una pœnarum tormentorumque sit facies) assidue volutant.)¹

Contrast this with the original of Menavino :

Anchora dicono, che Dio in mezo al' Inferno ha fatto un' albero di frutti copiosissimo, et che ogni pomo è simile à una testa di Demonio ; il quale tra quegli fuochi si ardentissimi, (come è di Dio uolonta) uerdissimo si mantiene, et è chiamato ZOACCUM AGACCI, che uuol dire albero d'amaritudine ; et quiui quelle anime mangiando di tali frutti, credendosi rinfrescare, si troueranno piene d'amaritudine ; et per quelle, et per lo souerchio lor dolore delle pene infernali, si dimenticheranno, et i demoni le legheranno con cathene di fuoco, et per tutto l'Inferno gli strascineranno (*I Costumi . . . de Turchi*, 1551, pp. 76-7).

Menavino is followed word for word by Müller in his German version.²

Yet another detail points to Marlowe's use of the version of Lonicerus. Both Menavino and Müller name the tree Zoaccum ; Marlowe adopts the form used by Lonicerus, with one *c*. The tree and its legend are often alluded to by chroniclers of the Turks, and the name appears in an astonishing variety of spellings : Ezecum (the proper form), ezetum, with misprint of *c* to *t*, azacum,³ azachum,⁴ alzekom(n)⁵ ; nowhere but in Lonicerus have I found Marlowe's form, zoacum, certainly not in the versions of the Koran then available.⁶ Marlowe's only two additions to the passage are trite classical allusions ; the first, "flourisheth as Flora in her pride," springs naturally from the word *florere*, and from his own earlier line, "like to Flora in her mornings pride."

(b) *Personal names and titles*.—From the above it may fairly be assumed that Marlowe had one of the editions of Lonicerus in his hands before writing *Tamburlaine*, Part II. If he used it at all, he would probably find something else quotable in this storehouse of Turkish annals.

Certain personal names used by him are not to be found in his accepted sources, Mexia and Perondinus, nor in their exact forms in

¹ *Tamburlaine*, Part II, ll. 2939-47 (Marlowe's Works, ed. Tucker Brooke) ; Lonicerus, *op. cit.*, 1578, Tom. I, f. 64^r ; 1584, Tom. I, p. 122.

² *Türkische Chronica*, 1577, Bk. II, f. 26^r.

³ Volaterranus, *De Mahom. Lege*.

⁴ Geufraeus, *Aulæ Turcicæ*, 1577, i, 293.

⁵ Bedwell, *loc. cit.*

⁶ E.g. *Alcoranum Latine transcriptum*, ed. Bibliander, 1543, p. 139, l. 44.

such authorities as Kellner cited.¹ The first item in the collection of Lonicerus, *Turcorum Origo*, is apparently a compilation of his own from the work of Paulus Jovius and others, and contains many names, which in a bewildering variety of spellings are to be found in other chronicles of Turkish affairs.

Tamburlaine's three sons were named, according to Chalcondylas, Sachruchus, Paiangures, and Abdulatriphes;² it is not surprising that Marlowe neglected, if he ever knew, these clumsy guttural forms, and chose instead such smooth and easily-running words as Caliphas, Amiras, and Celebinus. But it is odd that he adopted such Turkish titles as those now familiar to us in Caliph, Emir and Ameer to form names for princes supposedly Scytho-Egyptian by birth, Persian by rule. He may have taken a hint from Lonicerus:

Vocatur idem generali nomine AMIRAS et Caliphas, quod successorem significat: summumque Principem, penes quem imperii et religionis potestas esset, quales fuere Babylonis, ubi regni postmodum fuit sedes, hoc nomine intellexerunt (*op. cit.*, 1578, I, f. 3; 1584, I, 5).

Tamburlaine's third son, Celebinus, usurps a title of Bajazeth's heir, which Marlowe could find in Perondinus.³ The name is explained by Lonicerus as a title in connection with this heir of Bajazeth, Calepine, as both he and Marlowe style him. In *Tamburlaine*, Part II, he is addressed at his coronation in full as "Calepinus Cyricelibes, otherwise Cybelius."⁴ This concatenation is difficult to track in the chroniclers, especially the third name or title, and these spellings are still more unusual. Kellner traced Cyricelibes to Bajazeth's heir, but could not light on Marlowe's form, only on the Cyriskelebes of Georgievits and Curio, and the misprint Tyriscelebes of Paulus Jovius; he might have added the Zelebi and Cyriscelebim of Leunclavius.⁵ Lonicerus alone gives the full title, heading thus the chapter on this individual, whom he calls the fifth emperor of the Turks: "Calepinus Cyricelibes Qui et Cibelinus, quintus Turcorum Imperator"; and the chapter begins, "Post cladem Baiazethis, filius eius Calepinus Cyricelibes quem et Cibeliu nominant, fuga elapsus," etc.⁶ The name Celebinus seems to be a composite of the titular name (Cyri) Celibes

¹ *Engl. Studien*, 1886, ix, 297-301.

² Clauserus, *Chalcocondylæ . . . Libri Decem*, f. 53.

³ Chap. viii.

⁴ L. 3111.

⁵ *Annales Sultanorum*, pp. 187-92.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, 1578, I, f. 16; 1584, I, 27-8.

with the form *Cibelinus*. *Lonicerus* probably obtained his information from Guillaume Postel,¹ who gives *Calepine* the same name and title: "*Celeby* que nous avons appellé *Calepin*, pour leur langue qui se list sans points ou voyelles. . . . *Calepin* autrement appellé *Celeby*, et *Cyricceleby* de voix Greque et Turque" Elsewhere Postel, in speaking of a contemporary *Mahmud Celeby*, makes it plain that *Celeby* is a titular name: ²

c'est a dire le Gentilhomme, car la diction *Celebey* est comme qui droit Gentil, et se dit proprement de ceus qui sont enfans d'un pere autorisé, et en mocquant se dict de ceus qui ont esté . . . favoris en secret.

This is confirmed by *Geufraeus*.³ That Marlowe knew *Lonicerus* rather than Postel appears from Postel's meagre reference to a nameless tree of hell: "*l'arbre puant qui porte des fruicts puants, amers, pleins de venin, et que mangeront les damnés.*"⁴

(c) *Place-names*.—In names not only of characters, but also of places does Marlowe's indebtedness to *Lonicerus* appear. The poet undoubtedly, I think, took for his chief geographical authority the *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* of *Ortelius*,⁵ but he was not above accepting hints from chroniclers and cosmographers. Thus from *Lonicerus* he "lifts" a line of topography complete. One must note first that for *Tamburlaine*, Part II, Marlowe takes material outside the period of *Tamburlaine*, and serves his needs from that of *Mahomet II* and *Bajazeth II*. Even in Part I, *Techelles*, and certainly *Gazelles* and *Orcanes* in Part II, are personalities of this later period. In the description of the campaign of *Bajazeth II* against *Ismael Sophus*, the latter's ally *Techelles* fights against *Caragius Bassa* in *Bithynia*: ⁶

Hunc magno prelio superatum, atque in fugam coniectum, festinoque advolatu obrutum ac circumfessum conclusit intra *Cutheiam urbem ad Orminium montem*, in veteri *Caucorum* sede, quæ urbs totius *Asiæ* minoris umbilicus ac magistri equitum *Anatoliæ* sedes est.

In connection with that early "composite" battle of *Tamburlaine* against the Christians, *Frederick* describes the withdrawal of the *Natolian* army, "pitcht against our power Betwixt *Cutheia* and

¹ *Des Histoires Orientales*, 1575, pp. 364-5.

² *Ibid.*, p. 342.

³ *Aulæ Turcicæ*, i, p. 98.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 201.

⁵ Cf. my *Marlowe's Map in English Assoc. Essays and Studies*, vol. x.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, 1578, I, f. 28; 1584, I, p. 50.

Orminius mount." ¹ These forms are not those of Ortelius, who calls the town Chiutaie, and the mountain Horminius; further on Marlowe again calls the latter "proud Orminus mount," again adopting the form without initial H.

(d) *Juan Miques*.—The fourth possibility of Marlowe's indebtedness to Lonicerus is in some ways the most interesting as well as the most intricate, and takes us from *Tamburlaine* to *The Jew of Malta*. The passages cited so far occur in both editions; but in the second edition of 1584, and in that alone, is a reference to that Juan Miques, alias Josef Nassi, Duke of Naxos under Selim II, 1566–1579, whom Kellner long ago suggested as the prototype of the Jew. The chief difficulty in the attempt made by Kellner and Wagner ² to establish their claim for Juan Miques was their inability to point to any reference to him which could conceivably have been known to Marlowe. In Lonicerus there is such a reference, in the section which reproduces the *De Bello nuper Venetis a Selymo II Turcorum Imperatore Illato* of Giovanni Pietro Contareni: ³

Accidit deinde, non longo post tempore, ut Judæi quidam ex Occidente Constantinopolin scripserint ad Ioannem Michetem Marranum (quo nomine vocantur Iudæi, qui vi timoreque aliquo baptizantur) eique significarunt, Venetorum armamentarium, accenso in pulvere bombardico igni, una cum multis aliis eorum munitionibus, Idibus Septembris exustum esse, anno servatoris nostri MDLXIX et urbem ipsam cum tota ditione magna annonæ caritate laborare, vescique eos solo pane ex milio facto. Quibus rebus imperatori nunciatis, Ioannes Miches, qui illi familiaris erat, iamque ipsius cogitationes de Cypri regno intellexerat: hanc commodam occasionem esse, magnæ huius expeditionis suscipiendæ et rei feliciter gerendæ monuit: cumque illæ res fama magis magisque confirmaretur, Selymo facile persuasit, ut quod de Cyprico regno dudum animo conceperat, exequi conaretur. Itaque Selymus, quamvis capitibus articulisque fœderis cum republica Veneta initi, nuper subscripsisset, et iureiurando ea se servaturum sacrosancte promisisset.

Juan Miques' name occurs in the later detailed historical treatises, and in the composite histories on a larger scale. Kellner cited Foglietta's account of him as Joannes Michesius; we may add another reference to him in connection with the burning of the Arsenal in Balbi de Correggio, ⁴ also the full and independent accounts

¹ *Tamb.*, Part II, ll. 2811–12; for the composite battle, cf. *Times Lit. Suppl.*, June 16, 1921, p. 388.

² Kellner in *Engl. Studien*, 1887, x, 80 ff.; Wagner in edition of *The Jew of Malta*, 1889, pp. vi–vii.

³ *Op. cit.*, 1584, II, p. 3.

⁴ *Verdadera Relacion*, Barcelona, 1568, f. 6: "Iuan Miques judio estante en Constantinopla," etc.

of him in Belleforest's *Cosmographie Universelle* as the instigator of Selim's attack on Cyprus :

Micqué Iuif homme turbulent.—Cette tempeste apaisée, Selim homme adonné à ses plaisirs, . . . et un vray image de Sardanapale, se tenoit en repos, si un paillard Iuif nommé Micqué, homme subtil, rusé et malicieux, ne luy eut proposé, quel gaing il feroit s'il se ruoit sur les Chrestiens, veu que tous les plus grands Monarques Latins estoient empeschez à accorder et vider leurs differents aduenuz pour le fait de la religion : et luy conseilla d'attacher les Venitiens, et leur oster L'Isle de Chipre, comme des dependances du Royaume et Soltanie d'Egypte. A quoy Selim presta l'oreille (ii, 580).

Iean Micqué Iuif, quel homme.—À cecy fut il poussé par vn meschant Marran appelé Iean Micqué, Iuif et Espagnol, ou sorty des Iuifs que iadis Ferdinand chassa d'Espagne, homme fin et cauteleux, et lequel n'auoit laissé Prouince Chrestienne où il ne fut arrêté, car il auoit demeuré un long temps à Lyon negotiant en France, puis à Marseille, de là passa à Rome, visita la Sicile, et puis prit son adresse à Venise, où il fut fort sollicité de se faire Chrestien : mais comme il est cauteleux et meschant, piqué de haine contre cette Seigneurie, s'en partit lors que moins on y pensoit, et garda cette charité en son cœur, iusqu'à tant que se retirant avec les Turcs en Constantinople, il gagna l'amitié de Selim, et son pere estant mort, il le rendit mal vueillant de la Seigneurie Venitienne. Ce paillard retailé mit en auant au Turc circoncis de quelle consequence luy estoit l'Isle de Chipre, et combien ce luy estoit de deshonneur, qu'au milieu de son Empire les Venitiens tinsent vne si belle piece : ce qui incita le tyran à la redemander, et en default de la luy quitter de denoncer la guerre aux citoyens de St. Marc (ii, 785).

With these passages should be compared Barabas's references to the wide dispersal of his wealthy countrymen, in Greece, Portugal, Malta, Italy and France ; and of his financial interests :

In Florence, Venice, Antwerpe, London, Ciuill,
Frankfort, Lubecke, Mosco, and where not,
Haue I debts owing ; and in most of these,
Great summes of mony lying in the bancho.¹

A few years ago Professor Tucker Brooke put forth a strong plea² in favour of David Passi as the prototype of the Jew, a Turco-Jewish intriguer and merchant whose career reached its culmination in March, 1591, after half a dozen years of European notoriety. I hold no brief for Joseph Nassi, *alias* Juan Miques, against David Passi ; it seems to me doubtful whether there ever was any single prototype for the Jew. But I feel bound to point out that the link missing from Kellner's chain of argument is supplied. Here is a

¹ *Jew of Malta*, II. 162, 1580.

² *Times Lit. Suppl.*, June 8, 1922.

reference to Miques in a book which Marlowe certainly knew, and another in a popular encyclopædia of general information, which, by connecting Juan Miques with the great Jewish banking interests at Lyons, Marseilles and in Italy, partly meets Professor Tucker Brooke's objection that Miques' fame "rested upon political rather than commercial interests." It would, in fact, have been impossible for a Jew of the sixteenth century to aspire to any political influence unless he were in a position to tap the great sources of Jewish wealth to which Marlowe alludes. The modern historian of Juan Miques¹ states that he was a nephew of Dona Gracia Mendez, who had married into the great banking family of Mendez, which ran banks in France, and had financed Charles V and François I; also that he himself was involved in these interests; it is the boast of Barabas that, as an engineer, he

in the warres 'twixt *France and Germanie*,
Vnder pretence of helping *Charles* the fifth,
Slew friend and enemy with my stratagems.²

On the other hand, Professor Tucker Brooke's argument for Marlowe's probable knowledge of contemporary political activities has been much strengthened by the recent realisation of his connection with secret service work. Even more important, however, in this matter are the recent investigations of Dr. Wolf, which have established as fact the residence in Elizabethan London of families of wealthy and influential Jews, nominally Portuguese Christians or Marranos.³

Of these Jews with English connections, one of the most important was Alvaro Mendez, diamond merchant and political intriguer, kinsman of Juan Miques, whom he had visited in 1564, ally of the Portuguese Pretender, Don Antonio, and brother-in-law of Dr. Rodrigo Lopez. After the death of Miques in 1579, Mendez settled in Constantinople, and openly reverted to Judaism. Here he came into conflict with David Passi, also a royal favourite and an agent for Don Antonio; in 1591, Elizabeth upheld Mendez' character to the Sultan, even against the allegations of her own ambassador, Edward Barton; and, in the eighteen months preceding Marlowe's death, he twice sent Jews of his household to England on pro-Turkish missions. Another important Portuguese Jew resident

¹ M. A. Levy, *Don Josef Nasi, Herzog von Naxos*, Breslau, 1859.

² *Jew of Malta*, ll. 952-4.

³ Lucien Wolf, *Jews in Elizabethan England*, in *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, 1924-1927, xi, 1-91.

in London was Dr. Hector Nunez ; Barabas speaks of his compatriot "Nones in Portugall."

This new knowledge suggests some fresh possibilities for the background of *The Jew of Malta* ; first, that Marlowe may have derived some of his knowledge of Mediterranean politics and customs, and of names of places and persons, from the lips of men of Jewish or Turkish race. For instance, *Zabina* appears nowhere in records as the name of Bajazeth's queen ; but it is a possible attempt to reproduce the Turkish form of her real name or title, *i.e.* Despina, for she was a Greek princess, daughter of Eleazar or Lazarus, the Despot of Servia. Or again, "the mountain *Carnon*," from which water runs in leaden pipes to Constantinople,¹ is not to be found in any map or description of Constantinople known to me ; but it might be a confusion of the famous aqueduct of that city with a memory of its equally famous Golden Horn, seeing that Carnon represents adequately the Turkish for horn ; compare Selden's learned explanation, in his preface to Drayton's *Polyolbion*, of *Dulcarnon*, the famous crux in *Troilus and Criseyde*.

Secondly, the recent revelations of the intrigues that led to the death of Dr. Lopez, that poor shuttlecock between opposing great ones, suggest that *The Jew of Malta* may have been written as a political move, rather than as a mere sop to the public. But this is not susceptible of assertion until some one discovers who was Marlowe's patron. Whatever the exact state of affairs, we now know that it was possible for Marlowe in London to come into contact with Jews, all the more so if he was involved in secret politics.

II. Marlowe and Compilations on Mediterranean History and Geography.

One conclusion to be drawn from the above seems to be, that it is unwise to limit Marlowe's sources as we have been apt to do. One too often still sees the statement that Mexia's *Silva* and Peron-dinus' *Vita Magni Tamerlanis* are the sources of Tamburlaine. They may be the chief sources for the story of Tamburlaine, but they cannot supply the rich knowledge of Eastern history, geography and customs shown throughout the plays. For this, even the addition of Newton's *Historie of the Saracens* from Curio (1575) and Washington's *Navigations made into Turkie* by Nicholas Nicholay

¹ *Tamburlaine*, Part I, l. 978.

(1585) is not enough. There were also other accounts of Tamburlaine himself. Thus Lonicerus, whom Marlowe used for Part II, gives a very fairly full account of him, based on Perondinus; the 1578 folio has the advantage for a poet of furnishing pictures of Bajazeth in his cage, and of Tamburlaine using him as a horseblock (I, f. 12^r, 14).

Again, Chalcondylas has been ruled out by the authorities; it is difficult to see why. Kellner¹ himself admits that Mexia and Perondinus give few or no hints for Marlowe's women characters, whereas Tamburlaine's wife in Chalcondylas is made to have a personal interest in the war against Bajazeth. Kellner might have gone further, and asserted that the germ of the unpleasant "flying" between Zabina and Zenocrate is to be found in Chalcondylas and his derivatives. He tells of the provocation of Bajazeth to Tamburlaine, with the insulting message about his wife: "Nisi cum exercitu aduersum nos procedat, precor ut uxorem suam ter repudiatam tandem iterum assumat. Hoc quidem uergit in contumeliam Turcorum, uidelicet ter uxorem suam recipere, nisi persuadeatur."² Tamburlaine's wife, hitherto pitiful but now incensed, demands vengeance; Bajazeth repeats the insult with aggravations, to his own undoing. This seems to give the hint for such words as Zabina's scornful "Base Concubine," and Zenocrate's angry retort, "Callst thou me Concubine that am betroath'd Vnto the great and mighty *Tamburlaine*?" Agidas has already argued with Zenocrate that Tamburlaine keeps her "from the honors of a Queene," so that she is "supposde his worthlesse Concubine." From Chalcondylas too comes Tamburlaine's deriding of the captive emperor, when he protests against the treatment of his wife: "Hæc dicens, ingentem risum mouebat Temiri, qui hominem pro ludibrio habebat, ut qui nihil sani nec diceret, nec saperet."³ Marlowe could have consulted Chalcondylas in a direct Latin translation in a collection which also included Perondinus' work, i.e. that of Conradus Clauserus, a copy of which was in the library of the Earl of Arundel and later of its inheritor, Lord Lumley.⁴ In this useful compendium is brought together not only material for *Tamburlaine*, but also much for the background of *The Jew*.

There was yet another even more voluminous compilation, Belleforest's *Cosmographie Universelle* (1575), the amplified and

¹ *Engl. Studien*, ix, 297-301.

² Ed. Clauserus, p. 33.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 51A.

⁴ Clauserus, *Laomici Chalcocondylæ Atheniensis, de origine et rebus gestis Turcorum Libri Decem*, etc., Basle, 1556; Lord Lumley's copy is now British Museum C. 80, f. 8.

modernised translation of Sebastian Muenster's *Cosmographia*, from which I have cited above two accounts of Juan Miques. No book was more probable than Muenster's to be used as a reference and authority; Hakluyt cites it constantly, and Spenser versified one of its double-page illustrations.¹ Belleforest is to Muenster as Purchas was to be to Hakluyt. He brought the book up to date, adding new knowledge on the rapidly-changing realisation of the contours of land and sea, on the history and customs of the East, and bringing Mediterranean history down to recent happenings. Belleforest's translations of Bandello's tales and his *Harangues Militaires* were making his name well known; and his version of Muenster had the advantage of being in French, a language with which we now know that Marlowe must have been well acquainted. The lover of maps is also a reader of books of travel, and here Marlowe could find varied and peculiar information, drawn from all sources, classical and modern, and also a full account of Tamburlaine.

That Marlowe was casting his net into Mediterranean waters far beyond the range of the story of Tamburlaine is obvious. It has been seen that he imports into Part II characters and historical episodes from later Turkish reigns; there is a third importation which has not hitherto been pointed out. It was shown by Collier² that the episode of the deceit practised by the captive Olimpia with the poisoned ointment is borrowed from Ariosto's episode of Isabella with the pagan knight Rodomonte.³ But the first part of Olimpia's story, the death of her husband, her killing of her son, and her frustrated attempt to burn their bodies and to kill herself, is reminiscent of the tale of a heroine well known in annals of the Turko-Christian wars. The incident took place at the siege of Rhodes, according to the appreciative accounts of the historians, who regret their ignorance of the heroine's name. Belleforest's version appears to be a compressed translation from the Latin of Fontanus:⁴

Je suis marry de ne sçavoir le nom d'une femme Grecque quoy que non segnalee de pudicité, laquelle estant l'amye du gouuerneur du fort

¹ *Faerie Queene*, II, xii, stt. 22-24, an exact poetic transcription of the illustration between pp. 852 and 853 of the *Cosmographia* (1550).

² *Hist. of Engl. Dramatic Poetry*, iii, 119, on Tamburlaine, Part II, ll. 3412-3502.

³ *Orlando Furioso*, xxix, 10-29. There is no verbal resemblance to Ariosto in Marlowe's description of the magic ointment.

⁴ Belleforest, *op. cit.*, ii, 750, cf. Jacobus Fontanus, *De Bello Rhodio*, in Clauserus, p. 481.

de Rhodes, dès qu'eut entendu que ce sien seigneur et amy estoit mort en combatant vaillamment, comme aussi il estoit fort homme de bien : prit ses deux enfants qu'elle auoit eu de ce seigneur, et les baisant et embrassant, leur empraignit le signe de la croix au front, puis leur coupa la gorge, et les ietta au feu, disant qu'il n'estoit pas raison que ces enfants tant beaux, et sortis d'un pere tant illustre, seruissent aux plaisirs infames des Barbares : et fait cet acte (ne sçay si le doy plustost appeler brutal que magnanime) elle s'en court au lieu où estoit le corps de son amy, elle se vestit de la cotte, et Hoqueton d'armes de son seigneur, lequel estoit encore tout sanglant, et prenant son estoc au poing, s'en alla au milieu des ennemys, où faisant ce que les plus vaillants hommes executent, elle fut occise par les Turcs, lesquels elle pensoit que deussent lors emporter la ville.

The alteration in the death of the heroine is necessary in order to "contaminate" the story with Ariosto's episode ; and in her creed in order to situate her in a Turkish fort.

It is obvious that, while planning *Tamburlaine*, Part II, Marlowe was already reading those chronicles of Turkish aggression in the Mediterranean which were to give him the setting for *The Jew*. Any reader of the Christian chronicles must be struck with the extraordinary amount of detail and local colour which Marlowe assimilated. It is often impossible to put one's finger on a passage and say, this is from one chronicler, this from another, especially as Marlowe, quite deliberately, I believe, plays his trick of fusing, transferring circumstances, as of the siege of other islands to Malta, or of other campaigns to *Tamburlaine*. A few of the more definite examples may, however, be given to show Marlowe's handling of isolated facts and details.

Bajazeth's invocation of the

holy priests of heauenly *Mahomet*,
That sacrificing slice and cut your flesh,
Staining his Altars with your purple blood

may be due to Belleforest's comparison between two racial customs, the one drawn from Strabo on the priests of Antitauris :

Les Prestres Bellonaires vaticinants ou predisants . . . sacrifioient a iceluy soubz le nom de Bellone, non le sang des animaux . . . ains le leur propre, se deschiquetans les bras et les cuisses, ainsi qu'auons dit, que font certains sanctons et hermites esceruelez de Turquie.

Belleforest is referring to an earlier description of the Turkish dervishes who

se font des incisions avec leurs rasoirs le long des cuisses, des fesses, des bras, de l'estomach, et autres parties du corps, n'ayants membre qui ne soit deformé de horribles cicatrices.¹

Or again the golden armour and crest of the Scythians might well be mere common form of heroic poetry; but the description of the Scythian soldiers in Belleforest would justify it: "dorans leurs baudriers, et les crestes, de leurs morions, et salades, et soubz les braçals de leurs harnois."²

Or again, Barabas's description of

The wealthy Moore, that in the *Easterne* rockes
Without controule can picke his riches vp, etc.

suggests a combination of the riches of the country of Samarcand

Les esmeraudes y abondent lesquelles on tire, et recueille des creuaces des rochers . . . certains vents soufflans, on les voit reluire és montaignes.

with Pliny's account of the amethysts picked up in the Arabian desert, and with Ziegler's picturesque description of the Arabs at their work in the Isthmus where smaragds are to be found:

Topazius lapis uicinis locis effoditur, perlucidus, splendore aureo refulgens, ut interdiu uideri non possit, noctu exploratur ab his qui colligunt, et signo imposito sub die effoditur.³

Occasionally the very idiom and phrasing of the cosmographers seem to colour Marlowe's lines: his favourite word *glut* or *glutted* is reminiscent of Belleforest's "Toute la nation Scythienne a esté gloute du sang humain"; or again, Tamburlaine, by his early brigandage, is said to have amassed "un grand thresor et infinies richesses."⁴ Marlowe's striking use of the word *plage* in the sense of shore or region ("the Oriental Plage; the frozen Pla[g]e of heauen") is strongly reminiscent of the cosmographers.⁵ Often he fuses the characteristics of more than one Eastern nation: thus the gilded helmets come from the Scythians, the triple-plumed crests from the Turks, as from the picture in Nicholay of the sweeping ostrich plumes of the Janissaries.⁶ Sometimes he transfers the

¹ *Tamburlaine*, Part I, ll. 1446-8; Belleforest, *op. cit.*, II, 831, 597.

² *Tamburlaine*, Part II, ll. 4094-5; Belleforest, II, 1478.

³ *Jew of Malta*, ll. 56 ff. Cf. Belleforest, II, 1444, 1150; Ziegler, *Terræ Sanctæ Descriptio*, 1536, f. lxi^v.

⁴ Belleforest, II, 1474, 1451.

⁵ *Tamburlaine*, Part II, ll. 2393, 1763; cf. Clauserus, p. 320, "versus Orientalem plagam"; cf. Bibliander, *Alcoranum Latine transcriptum*, 1543, Tom. III, p. 10, l. 30, "in orientali plaga."

⁶ Washington's *Nicholay*, f. 73^v.

qualities of one character to another; thus Tamburlaine boasts that his blows are like the lightning's winged stroke, but it was Bajazeth who was named Hildrim (cœli fulgor).

One point perhaps deserves closer consideration. The Jew couples as paltry customers of his "those *Samintes* and the men of *Vzz*." Early editors emended to *Samnites*, Bullen to *Sabans* on the ground that "Between the Samnites and the men of Uz there can be no possible connection." An emendation more justifiable on the score of minim-misprints would be *Scenites* or *Scœnites*, and could be supported by the cosmographers. Thus Ziegler states that "Arabia Scœnitis a Pelusio incipit," and talks of "Scœnitarum Arabia"; Nicolay, quoting Pliny, applies the term *Scenites* to the nomad dwellers in Arabia Petra; and Belleforest cites from Strabo and Ammianus Marcellinus the description of the nomad tent-dwellers of Arabia, "pour ce appellez par les Grecs *Scenites*" [*skene*, a tent].¹ This reading would give point to Barabas's contrast drawn between the poor nomads and the wealthy Arabs who pay with gold in the ore. In detail of geographical and racial knowledge especially, the cosmographies could supplement Ortelius for Marlowe, Belleforest's section on Africa especially (II, 1786 ff.), where there is a detailed running commentary on the names and facts of the maps.

There was yet another voluminous and useful compilation, the *Cosmographie Universelle* (1575) of Belleforest's hated rival, André Thevet, and one or two points are more easily traceable there than anywhere else. Thevet, who loves marvels, gives three portents of Tamburlaine's death: a man with a spear, a comet, and last the ghost of Bajazeth with "un regard si hideux que merveille, et luy disoit: Auant que soit long temps, tu seras recompensé de tes meffaits, et moy vengé du tort que tu m'as fait, me faisant mourir comme une beste brute." He tramples Tamburlaine like a nightmare, and the next morning Tamburlaine dies, "ayant tousiours Bajazeth en bouche."² This is an elaboration of the ephialtes which, according to Perondinus, caused Tamburlaine's death. It would have been derogatory to the heroic conception of Tamburlaine to allow him to be scared to death by the ghost of one of his victims, although the hint of such a haunting is given in Bajazeth's wish that his "pin'd soule resolv'd in liquid ayre May styl excruciat

¹ *Jew of Malta*, l. 39; Ziegler, *op. cit.*, ff. lx, cxi; Nicolay, *op. cit.*, f. 121; Belleforest, *op. cit.*, 1157, 1177, 1179.

² *Op. cit.*, i, f. 308.

his tormented thoughts." The comet, however, affects the lament of Theridamas—"Fal starres that gouerne his natiuity," etc.—and the man with the spear is splendidly transformed in Tamburlaine's outcry :

See where my slaue, the vglie monster death
Shaking and quiuering, pale and wan for feare,
Stands aiming at me with his murdering dart,
Who flies away at euery glance I giue,
And when I look away, comes stealing on.

To these more definite points could be added references to matters of common knowledge, almost impossible to pin down, such as the description of Mahomet's suspended coffin, the sufferings and labours of Christian captives, the dislike of the Turks for the Christian's "superstitious belles." These could be gained either from conversation or from numerous books of travel. We may no longer restrict Marlowe to one or the other small treatise; the difficulty is rather to follow him in his knowledge. Many a passage which has struck one in reading as the natural product of a poet's mind, is found to be supported by a scholar's knowledge; to take one final example in the lines on the southern stars :

the stars fixt in the Southern arke,
Whose lovely faces neuer any viewed,
That haue not past the Centers latitude.

These lines really reflect the wonder still felt at the often-explained fact of the different constellations of the southern sky, and the often-quoted delight of Amerigo Vespucci¹ at sight of these stars "which are numerous, and much larger and more brilliant than those of our pole."

III. Marlowe in France.

Now that we know, on the authority of the Privy Council, that Marlowe spent some time in Rheims, fresh possibilities of speculation on his acquaintance with books and objects are opened up; French cosmographies become even more probable reading for him, and other books as well. For instance, it has always puzzled me that the view of Tamburlaine nearest approaching that of Marlowe was to be found in an early French printed book of the sixteenth century, *Les Fleurs des Hystoires de la Terre d'Orient*, edited from the work of Hetoum, Prince of Gorigos, or Hayton the Armenian. Here already is a Tamburlaine, not only heroic, but romantic and chivalric—a conqueror who is benign as well as cruel, the instrument of the

¹ Ramusio, *Delle Navigazioni*, 1554, f. 141 B.

Deity : " Tout ce qu'il faisoit le faisoit a la louenge de dieu, et que dieu luy commandoyt ainsi faire." He is kind towards Christians, has heavenly visions, honours women, and though he keeps the Turkish Emperor chained, yet " Le traictoit honorablement, et se deuisoyt souuent avecques luy." He loves fine velvets and silks, and when he captures Bagdad he finds at the bottom of the River Euphrates a ship filled with the royal treasure of Persia, also in a garden a tree of gold, all of which he sends to beautify Samarcand.¹ Did Marlowe light upon and read this flattering portrait of Tamburlaine ?

Again, it is an odd circumstance that among the *toiles peintes* which adorned the cathedral of Rheims was a series representing the taking of Jerusalem by Titus and Vespasian, and that a mystery-play on the same subject, " Le Mystere de la . . . Vengeance de Nostre Seigneur," was given in the town as late as 1530, to which great resort was made.² Of the two extant mystery-plays on this subject, one was frequently printed throughout the century ; in the printed forms occurs a circumstance which is certainly extraneous to the actual siege of Jerusalem, and almost as certainly was imported into the play in the fifteenth century from the story of Tamburlaine, the three banners of mercy or severity : Vaspasien gives the charge to his general, Ferrandon :

Mais affin que ie ne soye pas
Nomme cruel quant a ce cas
Je les vueil encore essayer
Et trois banieres deployer
Lune apres lautre en demonstrence
Signe de paix ou de vengeance
La premiere blar . . . era
Qui concorde sign . . . tra, etc.

More interesting is Vaspasien's justification of his final severity by his own rules :

Fait leur ay plus que ie ne doy
En mon ame comme ie croy
Et plus que de droit ne deuoie
Selon les termes de la loy
Pour les amender et si voy

¹ *Op. cit.*, Part V ; cf. especially chaps. x, xi, xviii, xix.

² Louis Paris, *Toiles Peintes et Tapisseries de la Ville de Rheims* ; cf. especially, I, lx ff., and the volume of plates ; cf. also Petit de Julleville, *Les Mystères*, II, 117-119, 451-460 ; for another (i.e. Mercadé's) version of the play, cf. *ibid.*, ii, 415, and Pein, *Untersuchungen über die Verfasser der Passion u. der Vengeance Jhesucrist*, etc., 1903. Gustave Cohen notes a later representation of the mystery at Plessys-Picquet, near Paris, in 1541 ; he does not, however, admit the connection between the plays and the *toiles peintes* ; see his *Hist. de la Mise en Scène*, pp. 144, fn. 1 ; 165 ; 121-122.

Que tousiours leur train se deuoye
 Je leur ay fait la paix offrir
 Pour douceur il nen ont eu cure
 Je ne puis pas tousiours souffrir
 Deulx cest force que ie procure
 A les pugnir selon droicture.¹

So Tamburlaine speaks :

They know my custome : could they not as well
 Haue sent ye out, when first my milkwhite flags, etc.

and again :

I will not . . . change my Martiall obseruations . . .
 . . . knowe my customes are as peremptory
 As wrathfull Planets, death, or destinie.²

Unfortunately the circumstance of the banners is not brought out in the *toiles peintes*, as it is in the play, or as is another circumstance of interest to Marlowe, the work of the Roman pioneers in cutting off the water-supply from the besieged city. There is a reference to the siege put into the mouth of Barabas, who says that the Christians were "ne're thought upon Till Titus and Vespasian conquered us"; but this does not in any way constitute a proved connection, only accentuates the oddity of the coincidence, and the undoubted archaism of tone, especially in *Dr. Faustus* and *The Jew*, which contrasts piquantly with the Renaissance modernity of Marlowe's work.

Is Marlowe then reduced to a drudging student, reading and working up a mass of material with the laborious accuracy of a modern historical novelist? Is his work degraded to a patchwork of gaily-coloured scraps of Eastern silks, a mosaic of Oriental stones? To me rather the impression has been one of admiration for his astonishing ease in handling, and for his imaginative power in transforming, this unwieldy load of learning. It might have made his knowledge as obvious and as overpowering as is Ben Jonson's; like him, he might have hung leaden plummets to his text, learned footnotes and accurate references. He was too skilled a dramatist and too fervent a poet. He conceals his art, and juggles with his facts so skilfully as to deceive even the very elect. Like every true poet, he was transmuting to his alchemic purpose all that he could lay hands on of metal worthy and unworthy.

¹ *La Vengeance et destruction de iherusalem*, [printed by] Trepperel, 1510, ff. 168^r, 173^r.

² *Tamb.*, Part I, ll. 1848, 1902.

THE MERCHANT OF VENICE AND THE "ALIEN" QUESTION

BY ANDREW TRETIAK

THE "alien" question seems to have been for the Elizabethan London a social problem of an acute and burning nature. Anti-alien riots happened there three times at short intervals, in 1588, 1593 and 1595. The last time (1595) they came to a disastrous end: five of the riotous apprentices were hanged on July 24 on Tower Hill. From the historical point of view this execution was the final episode of the anti-alien riots in the last decade of the sixteenth century, but it did not seem so to its witnesses. The wave of public indignation rose certainly very high in the fateful summer of 1595. The theatre, always very eager to express public opinion, was not permitted, it seems, to speak out publicly on this question. The tragedy of *Sir Thomas More* was probably never acted on the popular stage, even after the change of the Ill May Day scene, for the sake of which, I think, the whole chronicle-play was expressly and exclusively written. The tragedy of *Sir Thomas More* was written at the latest in 1594, perhaps even earlier, in 1593, immediately after the riots of that year, which unfortunately brought in their wake the arrest of Thomas Kyd and the violent death of Marlowe. After the executions of 1595 it was quite impossible for the theatre to be silent any longer. And so, I think, *The Merchant of Venice* came to be written.

The play is an appeal both to Queen Elizabeth for mercy¹ and to the Protestant refugees from France and Holland, residing in London, to seek a sort of *modus vivendi* with the original citizens. Four passages in *The Merchant of Venice* indicate that it was with premeditation that Shakespeare undertook to treat the alien question in this dramatic piece, and that he sought to suggest a solution of this difficult and dangerous problem of his time. The passages are:

¹ Portia's words on Mercy "sitting on the throne in the hearts of kings," etc.

III, ii, 27-28; III, iii, 26-31; III, v, 17-35; IV, i, 35-39. All these passages deal with Shylock's and his daughter's relation to the political and social conditions of Venice.

Shylock is a "stranger" in Venice, but he enjoys "the freedom of the state"; i.e. he is treated in all matters of justice, commerce and so on in the same way as the original citizens. This is "the commodity that strangers have with us" (III, iii, 27-28), and this is the coping-stone of the external policy of a sea-kingdom that wishes to make its capital the commercial capital of the world. Shakespeare approves of that policy: "the trade and profit of the city consisteth of all nations" (III, iii, 31-32). Speaking of Venice Shakespeare means London. In Shylock he sees the representative of all the foreign immigrants, who, having lost by expulsion, or by choice, their own country, become fully privileged denizens of another country, enjoying all the rights due to the native inhabitants of the place. I do not see any discord between the lines III, iii, 26-31 and IV, i, 35-39, as does Prof. J. Dover Wilson.¹ In Act III Shakespeare thinks of London as the capital of England where the whole foreign commerce of the country began to be concentrated. He looks here on London-Venice from the economic point of view, and from that of the external policy of the state. The words cited above cannot be interpreted as an allusion to the constitution of the state or the city. It is only the question of free trade between "all nations," of the feeling of security for those foreign merchants who might venture upon the exchange of commodities with England, and eventually might settle down in London, bringing their money and commercial energy to their new home. In the lines inserted in the play of *Sir Thomas More* (which I, for my part, take for original manuscript of Shakespeare) the political ideas are the same. More reminds the revolted citizens that they may be banished from England, and asks them what welcome they can expect in other countries after having violated the law of hospitality in their own. Only the most scrupulous regard for justice in international (commercial) intercourse can give a solid basis of external policy capable of conferring real benefits on the state. In Act IV Shakespeare looks on London from the point of view of internal policy. He thinks of it as an organised city with

¹ In his Notes to the edition of *The Merchant of Venice* in the New Shakespeare, 1926, pp. 113-114, where he infers from the alleged inconsistency in the depicting of the political background of the play in these places, that *The Merchant of Venice* is a work of two dramatists.

charters and "freedom," the which "freedom" is enjoyed also by all strangers. The danger lies in the possibility of creating a precedent. If justice should be denied to a stranger who has occasion to bring legal proceedings against a citizen, this would afterwards permit the government to make inroads upon the privileges of native citizens. The different trends of Shylock's appeals are also conditioned dramatically. Before the judgment Shylock importunes the Duke and strives to seduce him with the important argument of commercial policy; in the judgment-scene he tends to awaken sympathy with his standpoint in the breasts of the citizens present by threatening them with the risk of creating a dangerous precedent.

Shylock is symbolically the French, Walloon or Flemish refugee. It is easy to understand why Shakespeare chose a Jew as a representative of the foreign residents in London. The choice was nearly compulsory; it was, indeed, the only one possible if Shakespeare wished to treat the matter publicly. Officially Jews were not permitted to come and settle down in England, although they lived there and even exercised some influence in the last decade of the sixteenth century. But the anti-alien riots were not directed against them, and the Master of the Revels could take no exception to a play that represented a strife between a Jew and a Christian although it must have been evident to the contemporary theatre-goers that the play pivoted on the alien question. Shylock is to be taken in a more comprehensive sense than merely as a representative of the Jewish race. His racial characteristics seem to me no more outstanding than the French elements in the French heroes of Shakespeare's comedies or the Oriental blood in *Othello*. They have two sources, both literary: one of them is the mediaeval traditional portrait of a rich Jew who is always a sort of buffoon (as in the Croxton Play on Sacrament and in Marlowe's *Jew of Malta*); the other is the Holy Scripture, which is the source of Shylock's picturesque language. His repeated mentioning of "my tribe" betrays its provenance very distinctly.

At the same time the Old Testament is an internal link, connecting Shylock, the dramatic representative of the foreign element in a city, with the real historical aliens in London, the French and Dutch refugees, who, strong Huguenots, lived under the influence of the Old Testament. When Shakespeare lets Shylock say: "I will buy with you, sell with you, talk with you, walk with you, and so

following. But I will not eat with you, drink with you, nor pray with you," he gives a true picture of the distant relations of the refugees with the Londoners, limited exclusively to commercial intercourse. The mention of "not praying together" is significant. Shakespeare does not here refer to the possibility of Shylock's voluntary conversion to Christianity. On the one hand, these words are a slip of memory on the part of Shakespeare, who did not think of Shylock merely as a Jew, but, particularly when beginning the delineation of the character of a Jewish usurer, thought rather of a foreign Christian merchant in London.¹ Such merchants belonged to another Christian creed which did not differ fundamentally from the Anglican creed, and it was possible for Shakespeare to consider the eventual "praying together" of an English and a foreign merchant, both Christians, while it would have been quite impossible to imagine such a thing happening if Shylock was to be taken exclusively as a Jew. But on the other hand, it is a premeditated hint at the refugees. They did not pray together with the Londoners, having founded separate churches for themselves in London. The proclamations on the first day of the riots in 1593 were fixed to the door of the French and Dutch churches. Moreover, the foundation of the ethics of these "churches" seemed, in the eyes of the Anglican Londoners, to be taken over from the Old Testament with its well-known notion of "revenge." I think I find an allusion to the ethical views of the refugees in the words of Gratiano in the judgment-scene, especially in the words on the wolf, which are now understood as an allusion to the unfortunate Jewish doctor, Lopez, executed in 1594. Shylock's cruelty is here identified with the cruelty of the wolf, "hanged for human slaughter." We must take these words as implying something like the following: "Your spirit (Shylock's) is bad like the spirit of the Jew." *Tertium comparationis* lies, for me, in the Jewish racial element as represented in the Old Testament notion of revenge, and would be of no meaning if applied to the representative of Jews without some hidden thought of treating Shylock as the representative of foreign residents in general. We must not forget that Shakespeare and his contemporaries did not know, as we do now, that the executions of July 24, 1595, formed the

¹ Even in the judgment-scene Shakespeare commits two similar logical blunders concerning Shylock's religion: (1) Portia makes an allusion to the Lord's Prayer as if Shylock ought to have repeated it every day; (2) Shylock speaks contemptuously of the "stock of Barrabas" as if Barrabas, the symbol of highest villainy for a Christian, could have meant the same for a Jew.

closing incident of the anti-alien outbreaks of the period. Afraid that similar tragic events might be repeated, Shakespeare felt obliged to give a fair warning to the refugees that in the eyes of the Elizabethan public their bearing had nothing in common with Christian ethics and smacked rather of the Old Testament morals. And the latter were explained by the Christian official teaching as connected with the Jewish racial elements. As it seems that none of the Flemish or French residents were killed in the riots of 1595, the severity of the punishment (the death of five apprentices) looked, to contemporary witnesses, like *revenge*. We know that it was "at the complaint of the Elders of the Dutch and French Churches that Sir John Spenser committed some young rioters to the Counter." The intervention of the Elders may have ceased with this act recorded by Stowe, but it is easy to understand that the Londoners may have ascribed the severity of the punishment to their importuning the City authorities and the royal ministers, although in historical reality the verdict of death was the result of some further riots connected only loosely with the foregoing troubles, and directed against the City authorities. Shakespeare puts the words on the wolf in the mouth of the unsympathetic Gratiano, who is the representative of the lower strata of the citizens; he is the mouthpiece of the less cultivated public opinion. We therefore need not assume that Shakespeare himself held Gratiano's opinion as to the desire of the foreign residents for revenge; his purpose was to point out to the refugees how dangerous it is to awaken the feeling of popular indignation; how easily public opinion may misconstrue the motives of behaviour.

Having brought the alien question upon the stage, and having in the judgment-scene drawn a strict line between privilege and abuse,¹ Shakespeare looks for a solution of the problem. He sees two ways leading to a happy end of the trouble. One of them is Shylock's conversion to Christianity, the other Jessica's marriage with Lorenzo. The beautiful daughter of the old usurer, but "a daughter of his blood" only, not "to his manners," turns Christian and finds her happiness in the love of the Christian Lorenzo, a member of another nation. To Lorenzo, the aboriginal citizen of Venice, comes the whole wealth of the stranger, Shylock,

¹ The libel of 1593 complains, that "[Elizabeth] has been contented to the great prejudice of her own natural subjects to suffer you [the foreigners] to live here in better case and more freedom than her own people." This view was probably shared by Shakespeare.

for according to the verdict of the Duke none of Shylock's gold is lost to Jessica. Shylock accumulated his gold for his daughter only, and it goes its predestined way; nobody loses anything, nobody gains anything, through the final sentence of the Duke of Venice. In the intermarriage of the two elements of the mixed population Shakespeare sees the only possible solution of the alien question problem.

The question of intermarriages between Londoners and foreigners must have been a common subject of discussion in City circles. Indirect evidence of this may be found in the results of the official inquiry made twice in the year 1593. The first inquiry gave "the total of all the strangers with their children and servants born out of the realm" as 4300, "of which 297 were denizens." The second inquiry followed almost immediately, and now the principles of reckoning must have been somewhat different: "The number of the strangers of the French, Dutch and Italian churches did amount to 3325," and then follows a very significant remark: "whereof 212 were found to be English born." It is evident from this statement that public opinion accused the foreigners of separating themselves from the national English life, and that the magistrates sought to alleviate the accusation by pointing out that a relatively high percentage of the foreigners belonged by now to the second generation, were "English born" and ought to be treated as fellow-citizens. Shakespeare takes the same standpoint. He knows very well that the first generation of new-comers cannot change its national character, although he knows also that these new-comers ought to behave loyally towards their hosts. The second generation, born on English soil, has different obligations in this matter; its members ought to be, and to feel, English, and the best way to this end is the intermarriage of the two elements of the mixed population.

Speaking of intermarriages Shakespeare was obliged to deal with the economic side of the alien question. The riots of 1593 began by the attack of the apprentices on the strangers' market in Southwark, where they took butter by force, paying threepence instead of fivepence for a pound. The dearth was, as we know, ascribed to the increase of the population by the immigration of the refugees, although the better-informed annalist who takes the part of the government gives as the real reason of the dearth: "A too great foreign export." Shakespeare, it seems, took up the same standpoint as Stowe and ridiculed the unreasonable gossip of the city

in this matter. Lancelot is afraid that the conversion of Jessica will prove an economic disaster; it will raise the price of pork. "If we grow all to be pork-eaters, we shall not shortly have a rasher on the coals for money" (III, v, 32-33). Jessica repeats the words of the clown to Lorenzo, adding a very significant remark: "He says you are no good member of the commonwealth, for, in converting Jews to Christians, you raise the price of pork." Lancelot's allusion to high prices appears so unexpectedly in the context of the dialogue that it must be conceived as a special allusion to a disagreeable contemporary question. Lancelot's speech begins with the following repartee to the words of Jessica ("I shall be saved by my husband—he hath made me a Christian"): "Truly the more to blame he. We were Christians enow before, e'en as many as could well live, one by another." As Jessica, a Jewess, had lived in Venice before and was then no obstacle to the peaceful and comfortable life of the Venetians, the words of Lancelot must, I think, be interpreted in the sense that her conversion means her introduction *for ever* into the community of the aboriginal citizens. The question of the increase of population may perhaps be alluded to in these words of Lancelot, who sees some danger in accepting the immigrants into the normal life of the English nation, instead of sending them out of the realm, as the author of the anti-alien proclamation suggested. Shakespeare does not share this fear. He puts therefore an allusion to the question in the mouth of the vulgar clown and ridicules such fears in Lorenzo's answer to his servant. In this answer he accuses Lancelot of getting with child a negro cook, an alien also. The population cannot help increasing, the immigration cannot be stopped. The question is only which elements are introduced into the commonwealth. "I shall answer that better to the commonwealth than you can," says Lorenzo, who knows the worth of his bride.

This short dialogue which identifies Christian faith with the Venetian citizenship precedes the judgment-scene and throws some light on the other means of solving the alien problem: Shylock's compulsory conversion. The verdict of the Duke is outrageous to our contemporary moral sense, but it certainly was meant by Shakespeare only as an allegorical expression of the necessity of changing the national attitude on the part of the foreign residents in England. Shylock, the representative of the alien element in Venice, hated his cohabitants and separated himself from the social

life of his new country. Having become a Christian he is obliged to mix with his fellow-citizens, and perhaps he will learn to know them better, to esteem them, if he will not be able to love them. It is his faith that makes Shylock a stranger in Venice; it was the sense of national aloofness that made the foreign residents in London separate themselves from the current life of the capital of England. So faith is to be interpreted as an idea of nationality, and I think it may be said with some probability that Shakespeare's patriotic feeling was tinted with a slight nationalistic shade in the period of *King John*, *Richard II* and *Henry V*. The artistic flaw of allegorical expression (faith for nationality) remained and has become a source of misunderstandings as to Shakespeare's pro-Semitic or anti-Semitic views.

The contemporary theatre-goers did not misunderstand, I am sure, the social foundation of the play. Perhaps they were better informed than we are to-day, informed by the poet himself, even at the very beginning of the play. Antonio's first words, so difficult to interpret in any satisfactory sense, seem to convey the feeling of depression among the citizens of London due to the recent events of the summer 1595, and I suppose were so appreciated by the Shakespearean audience. Prof. Dover Wilson says with regard to Antonio's first speech: "This broken line (1, i, 7) in the middle of a speech is strongly suggestive of a 'cut.' Possibly the deleted matter would have thrown light upon the cause of Antonio's melancholy." I think Prof. Dover Wilson is quite right. It is possible that the censor found Antonio's words, explaining the cause of his sadness, too dangerous an allusion to contemporary events and caused them to be omitted. And so, perhaps, the "key" to the problem was lost.

GOLDSMITH AND THE *LITERARY MAGAZINE*

BY R. W. SEITZ

To collect and present negative evidence is at best an ungrateful task, but until this task is performed for Goldsmith's periodical writings, the canon of his works will not be established. We inherit attributions of previous editors, and unless some of these attributions are carefully examined, we shall be tempted on the basis of them to extend the bibliography of this author beyond reasonable limits. Some clearing away has already been accomplished by the elimination of the "Belles-Lettres" papers.¹ More remains to be done. And among other things Goldsmith's connections with the *Literary Magazine* need to be re-examined, for although in this case there has been considerable doubt concerning the authenticity of particular attributions, the problem has not so far been thoroughly studied.

The tradition that Goldsmith contributed to the *Literary Magazine* seems to have begun with Prior, who names four titles from this periodical as more or less certainly from Goldsmith's hand.² Cunningham mentions the magazine only in a note to the essay entitled, "Of the Pride and Luxury of the Middling Class of People," in the *Bee*.³ Forster says only,

The month in which he separated from Griffiths was that in which Newbery's *Literary Magazine* lost Johnson's services; but this seems the only ground for a surmise that those services were replaced by Goldsmith's. The magazine itself shows little mark of his hand, until his admitted connection with it some months later.⁴

¹ See Caroline F. Tupper, *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, xxxix (1924), 325-342.

² See *Life of Oliver Goldsmith*, M.B., i, 232-236. The titles are: "The Poetical Scale," the "Sequel to the Poetical Balance," "The History of Our Own Language" (from which is taken the article in the *Bee* entitled, "An Account of the Augustan Age of England"), and "Of the Pride and Luxury of the Middling Class of People."

³ *Works of Oliver Goldsmith* (1854), iii, 114 and note.

⁴ *Life and Times of Oliver Goldsmith* (1877), i, 123.

Gibbs, accepting without much question the attributions of Prior, adds three more of his own.¹ And since the relation between the *Bee* and the *Literary Magazine* provides perhaps the strongest single argument in favour of these attributions, still another article should be added to the list, namely, the contribution with the running title, "Custom and Laws Compared," which served as the principal source of the essay so headed in the *Bee*. The articles in the *Literary Magazine* with which Goldsmith's name has been in some way joined are, then, in chronological order :

The History of Our Own Times.²

The Poetical Scale, and the Sequel to the Poetical Balance, being Miscellaneous Thoughts on English Poets.³

Phanor : or the Butterfly Pursuit, A Political Allegory.⁴

The History of Our Own Language.⁵

On the Character of English Officers.⁶

Of the Pride and Luxury of the Middling Class of People.⁷

Custom and Laws Compared.⁸

It has seemed best to consider first, from evidence advanced by the various commentators and from an examination of the articles themselves, how far Goldsmith's authorship of these articles has been and can be proved, and later to test the hypothesis arrived at by reference to his general career during the period when they were appearing. They will be taken up in the groups into which they naturally fall rather than in chronological order.

The first group consists of "The History of Our Own Times" and "The History of Our Own Language," two series of articles loosely related by their general titles, and by their being far the longest of the attributions. The former owes its connection with Goldsmith's name to Gibbs. He discovered it to be in part the original of "The Political View of the Result of the Present War with America

¹ See below. The articles added by Gibbs are, "The History of Our Own Times," "Phanor : or the Butterfly Pursuit, A Political Allegory," and "On the Character of English Officers."

² II (November 15-December 15, 1757), [505]-509 ; iii (January 1758), [1]-6 ; (February 1758), [49]-56 ; continued as "The Present Crisis of Europe and America Reviewed," iii (July 1758), [289]-292.

³ III (January 1758), 6-8 ; (February 1758), 59-61. See *The Works of Oliver Goldsmith* (J. W. M. Gibbs, 1885-1886), iv, [417]-423 ; 423-428.

⁴ III (January 1758), 8-11. See Gibbs, iv, 429-436.

⁵ III (February 1758), 56-58 ; (March 1758), 102-105 ; (April 1758), 150-153 ; (May 1758), 197-200. See Gibbs, iv, 437-462 ; ii, 443-452.

⁶ III (March 1758), 105-109. See Gibbs, iii, 450-457.

⁷ III (May 1758), 209. See Gibbs, ii, 431-432.

⁸ III (July 1758), 315-316. See Gibbs, ii, 428-430.

upon Great Britain, France, Prussia, Germany, and Holland," a work preserved in Goldsmith's autograph and mis-named "The Preface and Introduction to the History of the Seven Years' War,"¹ and he concluded thence that Goldsmith must have written the series of articles as well as the manuscript.² Gibbs, however, failed to observe certain other articles in the magazine which likewise served as sources for the "Political View." He did not notice that, as has since been pointed out,³ the "Preface" to that work derives largely from two essays contributed to the magazine by Samuel Johnson in 1756, and entitled respectively, "An Introduction to the Political State of Great-Britain" and "Observations on the Present State of Affairs."⁴ He missed also an article of undetermined authorship, "Of the Constitution of the German Empire," which appeared in the September-October issue of the same year, and which contributed to the section on Germany in the "Political View."⁵ Moreover, besides these magazine articles, Goldsmith included at least one book among his sources for the work in hand. Much of the matter which Gibbs regarded as original amplification of "The History of Our Own Times" was lifted bodily from a popular treatise of John Campbell's, first published in book form in 1750, under the title *The Present State of Europe*.⁶ Since, then, "The History of Our Own Times" is only one of the many ingredients which went to make up the potpourri of the "Political View," it cannot be assigned to Goldsmith merely on the ground that it was a source.

The internal evidence, though from the nature of eighteenth-century prose it cannot be regarded as conclusive in either direction, furnishes little support for Gibbs's attribution. Throughout the four substantial sections which make up "The History of Our Own Times" there is to be found no striking idea or expression that Goldsmith, as was his habit,⁷ made use of in his later works. And this fact is not owing to any dearth of striking phrases in the articles

¹ Brought to light and so entitled by Prior. See *Life*, i, 319-320, 380-383; *Miscellaneous Works* (New York, 1859), i, 474-532.

² See Gibbs, iv, 437 n., 452 n.; v, 7, 59 n.

³ By John W. Oliver, in the *Times Literary Supplement*, May 18, 1922, p. 324.

⁴ *Literary Magazine*, i (Number 1, 1756), [1]-9; (July 15-August 15, 1756), [161]-165.

⁵ Cf. i, [273]-274, and Gibbs, v, 38-39.

⁶ The work appeared first in *Dodsley's Museum; or the Literary and Historical Register* (1746-1747). It had gone through six editions by 1761. Goldsmith's indebtedness to this book will be discussed elsewhere.

⁷ See Ronald S. Crane, *New Essays by Oliver Goldsmith*, pp. xx-xxix.

themselves. Perhaps the opening sentence of the first article comes closest to his usual style "It would be as impossible," writes the author,

for a man to form a judgment of the plan and situation of a magnificent palace, by being introduced into one or two of its most ordinary apartments, and hood-winked as to every thing else about it, as it is for him to form a true idea of the present system of *Europe*, by dipping into the history of its occurrences in periodical pamphlets and papers, which are confined to the views of a party, or perhaps the lye of the day.

The two following passages, which have been selected from a number of the same type, are, however, by no means in Goldsmith's vein, and they were rejected even from the "Political View." "The queen of *Hungary*," we are told,

like a litigious plaintiff, made answer to all the overtures for peace, that she would do nothing without the advice of her lawyer, the *French* king, and he, like a shuffling attorney, pretended that he could not prescribe to his client.¹

And again, of the character of Maria Theresa's consort we read,

For a prince who had great interests of his own to pursue, with a proper spirit to support them, never would have resigned to the distaff what he owed to his sceptre, nor have sacrificed to his bed what was due to his throne.²

Indeed, Johnson's two essays contributed far more than "The History of Our Own Times" to the resources of that literary work-bag where Goldsmith was accustomed to store favourite phrases and ideas for future use. Much of the *Public Ledger* paper of March 13, 1760, later entitled "Of the War now Carried on between France and England, with Its Frivolous Motives," came from the "Observations on the Present State of Affairs."³ Again the pungent expression with which Johnson rounds off his paragraph concerning Jamaica in "An Introduction to the Political State of Great-Britain," although omitted from the "Political View," reappears twice later.

¹ *Literary Magazine*, iii (February 1758), 52. Cf. Gibbs, v, 51.

² *Ibid.* iii (January 1758), 5. Cf. Gibbs, v, 47.

³ Cf. J. W. Oliver, *Times Literary Supplement*, May 18, 1922. The *Ledger* paper appears as Letter XVII of the *Citizen of the World* (see Gibbs, iii, 62-65). See also Crane, *op. cit.*, p. 96, n. This Letter seems also to owe something to Johnson's review of Lewis Evans's *Geographical, Historical, Political, Philosophical and Mechanical Essays* (see *Literary Magazine*, I [September 15-October 15, 1756], 298-99).

First modern Persia and then Holland are represented in slightly different phrase as "a den of tyrants, and a dungeon of slaves."¹ And the clause in the same essay describing Canada as "a drain into which the waste of an exuberant nation might be thrown," is elsewhere applied by Goldsmith to "the deserts of America," and later to Nova Scotia.² Thus one of the principal methods of identifying Goldsmith's anonymous prose compositions—namely, that of finding in them phrases and ideas which he used elsewhere—yields only negative results in an examination of "The History of Our Own Times."

A careful analysis of the additions which Goldsmith makes in the "Political View" to the portions of the text borrowed from "The History of Our Own Times" weakens still further the grounds for attributing the latter to Goldsmith. In this matter of additions he seems to have treated all his known sources impartially, and in each of the examples given below it will be seen that the new expression is more typical of Goldsmith than is the context. Of the political rights of English citizens, Johnson writes,

The time is now come in which every *Englishman* expects to be informed of the national affairs, and in which he has a right to have that expectation gratified. For whatever. . .

Goldsmith, apparently fired with enthusiasm at the idea, writes,

The time is now come in which every English man expects to be informed of the national affairs, because he himself is immediately concerned in their carrying on. That is a part of his liberty, it ensures

¹ *Literary Magazine*, i (Number 1, 1756), 4. Cf. Letter XXXV of the *Citizen of the World* (Gibbs, iii, 134), and the *Traveller*, l. 309 (Gibbs, ii, 15).

² *Literary Magazine*, i (Number 1, 1756), 4. Cf. *Citizen of the World*, Letter XVII (Gibbs, iii, 64), and *An History of England in a Series of Letters from a Nobleman to his Son* (1764), ii, 192 (cf. *The History of England from the Earliest Times to the Death of George II* [1771], iv, 342). Letter XCVIII of the *Citizen of the World* also seems to have been influenced by one of Johnson's early articles in the magazine. In the "Memoirs of the King of Prussia" (see *Literary Magazine*, i [October 15–November 15, 1756], [327]–333; [November 15–December 15, 1756], [383]–390; [December 15–January 15, 1757], [439]–442), attributed to Johnson by Boswell (see *Life of Johnson* [New York], i, 23), occurs the clause:

To embarrass justice by multiplicity of laws, or to hazard it by confidence in judges, seem to be the opposite rocks on which all civil institutions have been wrecked. . . . (*Literary Magazine*, i, 384).

In the Letter, which was first published in the *Public Ledger* for November 28, 1760, the same clause appears in different context. It reads,

To embarrass justice returned I, by a multiplicity of laws, or to hazard it by a confidence in our judges, are, I grant, the opposite rocks on which the legislative wisdom has ever split. . . . (*Public Ledger* text. Cf. Gibbs, iii, 361).

his certainty of that liberty, and he has a right to be gratified in his expectation. Whatever. . .¹

More distinctive is his interpolation of the following into the passage borrowed from *The Present State of Europe* and incorporated in the chapter "Of England." Concerning the early English invasions of France, the *Present State* asserts,

It is however very possible that they [these early expeditions] might be in some measure necessary, as our Constitution then stood; and we shall have the more Reason to credit this, . . .

Goldsmith, probably echoing an idea from the essays of Johnson previously mentioned, says,

Notwithstanding what has been said, it is possible they might also be in some measure necessary, as our constitution then stood. France might serve as a drain to carry off the peccant humours in the political constitution at home; and we shall have the more reason. . .²

Coming to the passages derived from "The History of Our Own Times," we find an even more clearly marked tendency to add to the source typical Goldsmithisms. Of the French activities in America we are told, for example, that,

By the help of their missionaries, the most artful set of men in the world, they had gained over some of the most warlike of the *Indian* nations, and upon them they built for exterminating the *English* interests there.

In the "Political View," this passage becomes,

By the help of their missionaries, men who at once served the interests of religion and their country, they gained over to their side the savage but warlike inhabitants (of this country) [words in parentheses inserted above the line] who generally lived by hunting and wandered along those trackless deserts for a precarious subsistence.³

Again, writing of the Dutch, Goldsmith introduces one of his favourite theories on the subject of wealth and conquest. "What

¹ *Literary Magazine*, i (July 15–August 15, 1756), [161]; see Gibbs, v, 16. (The passages from the "Political View" are quoted from a photostat of the original manuscript.) For Goldsmith's sentiments on the subject of English liberty, cf. the *Series of Letters*, i, 8; ii, 234–235.

² *The Present State of Europe* (1757), p. 506; see Gibbs, v, 19. Cf. the *Series of Letters*, i, 207.

³ *Literary Magazine*, iii (July 1758), [289]; see Gibbs, v, 29. Cf. the *Polite Learning* (Gibbs, iii, 468, n.). "In early ages, when man was employed in acquiring necessary subsistence, or in defending his acquisitions, when without laws or society he led a precarious life, while even the savage rivalled him in the dominion of the forest; . . ." Cf. also the *Traveller*, ll. 410 ff.

shall we think of such a people; or shall we give up their case as desperate?" he asks,

By no means, calamity may again reduce them to their pristine virtue, . . . Their beautiful palaces, gay equipages, and all the gilded trappings that adorn inventive luxury will only serve to invite the invader, for never did history furnish a single instance of a country very wealthy and very weak that was not at last the prey of its more potent and poorer neighbours. But still I say their calamity may bring them to an exertion of their former virtue, for in no country is that political maxim more likely to take place,] That dominion is to be maintain'd by the same arts it was acquired.¹ [*sic*.]

And concluding the chapter on Germany, Goldsmith departs from his source to add,

Germany is now truly destroying itself, and feels all the miseries of a civil war without expecting a change for the better which is generally the effect of intestine commotions.²

Goldsmith, then, seems to bring to the text of "The History of Our Own Times" ideas and expressions of his own rather than to find them there ready for use in the "Political View."

Furthermore, among the portions of "The History of Our Own Times" omitted from the "Political View" occurs at least one passage which certainly does not express Goldsmith's later sympathies. He who spoke of Hanoverian dogs and who wrote in his history so coldly of the expeditionary force sent to the aid of the Hanoverians must have had a sudden change of heart if he could once have written thus of George II's continental policy,

And this we conceive to be the proper place for setting the convention [of Kloster-Seven], concluded between his royal highness the duke of Cumberland and the duke de Richlieu the French general, . . . in a proper light . . . not to mention that no public writer among ourselves has thought the interests of his majesty's German dominions,

¹ See Gibbs, v, 53. The brackets indicate that the text in the photostat is obscured at this point. Cf. *Literary Magazine*, iii (February 1758), 54. The magazine text reads,

"Calamity has effected it before this crisis, and too probably, a crisis approaching (*sic*.) when it will do it again. The history of no people contains so strong proofs as that of the Dutch does of the truth of that maxim, *That dominion is to be maintain'd by the same arts thro' which it is acquir'd.*"

Cf. "The Natural Rise and Decline of Kingdoms, Exemplified in the History of the Kingdom of Lao" (Gibbs, iii, 90-94); and the *Series of Letters*, i, 29.

² See Gibbs, v, 52. Cf. *Literary Magazine*, iii (February 1758), 53. Cf. for Goldsmith's attitude towards civil war, *Series of Letters*, i, 207; ii, 26-27, 178, 181-182.

tho' suffering for our sakes, of importance enough to engage his attention. . . . But the case of the *Hanoverians* and their allies, was attended by much more tender considerations in the breast of his *Britannic* majesty, who is bound and sworn to protect and preserve the people he governs. How could he, consistently with these obligations, see his subjects oppress by his enemies, and treated as the most abject of slaves, and himself in his electoral dignity considered as a despicable vassal to *France*, who, in this case, uses the same argument, and no other, that their predecessors did to the *Romans*, *væ victis*, by throwing into the scale of their demands, every condition that can gratify the extremes of pride, ambition, and tyranny.¹

Is it probable that the author of this passage is identical with the one who wrote the following account of this matter ?

This passion for carrying on a continental war, was not less pleasing to the Monarch from his native attachments, than to the people from their natural propensity to arms. As soon as it was known that Prince Ferdinand had put himself at the head of the *Hanoverian* army, his *Britannic* Majesty, in a speech at the opening of the session of parliament, observed, that the late successes in Germany had given an happy turn to his affairs, which it would be necessary to improve. . . . Each victory they gained, however, only served as a pretext to call over new forces from Britain, while the English ministry were taught to believe that every last battle would be decisive. . . . But laurels seemed to be all that England reaped from the conquered field. . . . War was the trade of some Generals, and, it must be allowed, a gainful trade it was. Let me therefore, here again, pass over this continued repetition of marchings, skirmishes, and rencounters, nor load the page with names of German Generals, too difficult to be pronounced by an English tongue, and equally grating to a patriot ear. The victories of either side might, in fact, be considered as a compact by which something was to be lost on either side, and no advantage to be acquired. The English, at length, began to open their eyes to their own interest ; nor could all the splendours of victory so far blind them, as not to see that they were waging unequal war, and assuming new loads of taxes for conquests they could neither preserve nor enjoy.²

Such a volte-face in opinion is of course possible in the case of a mind so malleable as Goldsmith's, but if the *Literary Magazine* papers be accepted as his, they must be regarded as containing a unique expression of his whiggish sympathies.³

¹ *Literary Magazine*, iii (January 1758), 2-3. It is perhaps worthy of notice that when Goldsmith has occasion to speak in "Political View" of the glory of England during this war, there is no mention of "his *Britannic* majesty" (cf. the first two paragraphs of the "Preface," Gibbs, v, 7-8).

² *Series of Letters*, ii, 245-247.

³ In his discussion of Denmark, the author of these papers inclines towards a definite sympathy with the house of Stuart (see ii [November 15-December 15,

It is clear that the internal evidence yields little support to Gibbs's attribution, and that the burden of proof remains with him who would claim this series of articles for Goldsmith.

The traditional association of "The History of Our Own Language" with Goldsmith's name goes back to Prior, who saw in the series "traces of his manner, though not decisive in their nature, . . ." ¹ Gibbs goes into the matter more fully. In a note to "An Account of the Augustan Age of England," an essay in the *Bee*, which is largely derived from the last of the "Language" papers, he writes,

It is generally agreed that the present paper ["An Account of the Augustan Age of England"] is by Goldsmith, yet the fact of its being an excerpt, . . . throws, perhaps, some doubt upon the authorship. If, however, this paper is by Goldsmith, the remaining portion of "The History of Our Language" must surely also be by him.²

On the basis of this and of some other inconclusive evidence collected in his notes ³ Gibbs reprints for the first time the earlier sections of

1757], 508, and iii [January 1758], 1), a sentiment not repugnant to Goldsmith. On the other hand, Goldsmith nowhere else reveals such a vindictive spirit towards the French as is revealed above. In the article "On Public Rejoicings for Victory," probably written by Goldsmith, and published in the *Busy Body* for October 20, 1759 (see Gibbs, iv, 462-468), the author ridicules the exorbitant demands of his jingoistic countrymen and favours moderate terms of reconciliation. In the "Political View," Goldsmith remarks, ". . . if after so frightful a picture of the present age, every power would sit down contented with the same state which they enjoy'd before the war; how happy still might Europe be!" (see Gibbs, v, 59). The author of the magazine articles concludes his series with the pious hope "that a peace will soon be concluded, which will disable those two ambitious vindictive powers [France and Austria] from disturbing the peace of Europe for half a century to come" (iii [July 1758], 292).

¹ I, 235.

² II, 443 n. Cf. p. [456].

³ He notes certain analogies between passages in these articles and passages in Goldsmith's other works. Goldsmith, for example, in his four-volume *History of England* seems to share with the author of these papers his high estimation of Anne Boleyn's letter to Henry VIII (iv, 445, and n.). They appear to hold the same preference for natural as opposed to cultivated eloquence (iv, 450-451, and n.). They both think highly of oratory in the time of Charles I (iv, 459, and n.), and both speak feelingly of the troubles of his reign (iv, 460, and n.). Again they seem to be together in their admiration for history that is "destitute of all the rules that have been laid down for history-writing; . . ." (iv, 461-462, and n.) (Gibbs's references to doubtful works have been excluded from this list).

He further attaches some significance to the signature "Brito," affixed to the first section (iv, 514-515. Cf. pp. 442, and n., 452 n., and iii, 458-459).

Again, he notices, though he makes no use of this point in his argument, that Goldsmith borrowed from these papers in the *Series of Letters* (v, 308-309, and n.).

This will suffice to show the nature of Gibbs's evidence. None of his cross-references is completely convincing, and if there be any connection between two of these passages, it would prove no more than that "The History of Our Own Language" served as a source for other things beside the *Series of Letters*. The reliance on signatures will be shown to be unwarranted.

"The History of Our Own Language" in his edition of Goldsmith's works.

Gibbs's reasoning in the latter part of the foregoing quotation is obviously faulty. There is little reason to doubt that Goldsmith wrote the "Augustan Age" paper, for, though Gibbs does not make this clear,¹ the three opening and three of the four concluding paragraphs owe much to the *Enquiry into the Present State of Polite Learning in Europe*.² But it by no means follows that since Goldsmith wrote the *Bee* essay, he must, therefore, have written "The History of Our Own Language," or even the last section of it. Certainly the two elements which comprise it are not altogether congruous. The opening sentence of the first paragraph, for example, is a fairly direct criticism of the kind of writing to which "The History of Our Own Language" belongs. "The history of the rise of language and learning," says Goldsmith, "is calculated to gratify curiosity rather than to satisfy the understanding." And in the last paragraph of the paper as it stands in the *Bee* occurs a flat contradiction of a literary opinion expressed in the rejected last paragraph of the magazine article. "The History of Our Own Language" concludes as follows:

It is sufficient to observe, that it was owing to the authors which the reign of Queen *Ann* produc'd, that the public, when left to itself, has now a much better judgment in poetry than it formerly had. Many excellent poems in blank verse, have enrich'd our language, with a variety of compounded words and epithets, which in time may give it graces superior even to those of *Greece* and *Rome*.³

With these sentiments Goldsmith, in the paragraphs which he added in the "Augustan Age" paper, is in total disagreement. "I am at a loss," he writes,

¹ Gibbs gives one reference to the *Polite Learning* (ii, 451 n.), but makes no further comment.

² For the first three paragraphs, cf. Gibbs, iii, 492, 494 n., 496, 503, 531. The following passage is taken over almost verbatim:

"In that period of British glory, though no writer attracts our attention singly, yet, like stars lost in each other's brightness, they have cast such a lustre upon the age in which they lived, that their minutest transactions will be attended to by posterity with a greater eagerness, than the most important occurrences of even empires which have been transacted in greater obscurity" (Gibbs, ii, 444; cf. iii, 531).

For the later paragraphs, cf. iii, 492-493, 508 n., 509, 512-513. We find here the mention of "More Savage, and Amherst," which compares with the "Sale, Savage, Amhurst, More," of the first edition of the *Enquiry* (Gibbs, iii, 508 n.).

³ *Literary Magazine*, iii (May 1758), 199-200. Cf. *Polite Learning* (Gibbs, iii, 516).

whether to ascribe this falling off of the public [interest in poetry] to a vicious taste in the poet, or in them. Perhaps both are to be reprehended. The poet, either dryly didactic, gives us rules which might appear abstruse even in a system of ethics, or, triflingly volatile, writes upon the most unworthy subjects; content, if he can give music instead of sense; . . . the public, therefore, with justice, discard such empty sound, which has nothing but jingle, or, what is worse, the unmusical flow of blank verse, to recommend it.

It is interesting to notice that Goldsmith's antipathy to the "pedantry" of blank verse is even more strongly expressed in the *Polite Learning*,¹ a work which he was almost certainly writing while "The History of Our Own Language" was appearing. It is difficult to believe that even Goldsmith would thus have blown both hot and cold at the same time on a subject in which he must have had some interest.

If it is unlikely that Goldsmith wrote the last section of "The History of Our Own Language," it is even less likely that he wrote the rest of these articles. Gibbs remarks in his appendix to the *Bee* that the series,

is perhaps chiefly notable as a work of Goldsmith, on account of its containing what may be viewed as a more adequate judgment upon Shakspeare and Milton than occurs elsewhere in the author's writings.²

It would be pleasant to be able to claim some adequate criticism of Shakespeare and Milton for Goldsmith, but even if the remarks in the "Language" papers can be regarded as such, the method of approach is not Goldsmith's. "The style of Othello," writes the author of "The History of Our Own Language," "has not the least resemblance to that of Macbeth, nor the language of Hamlet to that of Lear."³ And if, with our knowledge of Goldsmith's tendency to generalise rather than particularise,⁴ we are yet willing to accept

¹ See Gibbs, iii, 512, 513. Cf. the "Dedication" to the *Traveller* (ii, 4).

² II, 456.

³ Gibbs, iv, 454. I quote from Gibbs here, since the issue in which this section appears is missing from the file in the Yale Library.

⁴ If, on the authority of Thomas Wright and Isaac Reed (see Prior, i, 315-316), we accept the review of Coxeter's edition of Massinger's works as Goldsmith's, we have a passage on Shakespeare, written a year later than "The History of Our Own Language," which is much more in his general manner. It reads,

"Nothing less than a genius like Shakespear's could make plays wrote to the tastes of those times pleasing now; a man whose beauties seem rather the result of chance than design; who, while he laboured to satisfy his audience with monsters and mummery, seemed to throw in his inimitable beauties as trifles into the bargain" (*Critical Review*, viii [July 1759], 87).

such a statement as his, we must balk at the author's philological discussion of Shakespeare's language. Would Goldsmith have told his reader "that in Staffordshire a *wretch* was a common expression for a young girl or woman; that a *card* in our Northern parts signifies a *brawling vagabond*," etc.? ¹ And if the author introduces philology into his discussion of Shakespeare, he is, of course, preoccupied with it in the first paper, where he considers the origins of the English tongue. He is there interested in discrediting "Dr. Hicks, and most *English* antiquaries," in establishing the fact that "the *Scots* who inhabit the *Western* islands" had until recently spoken "a purer *Celtic* than the *Welsh* and the *Irish*," and that Barbour was a good example of that group of writers of the *North*—where "the *Anglo-Saxon* tongue prevailed in its greatest purity,"—who preceded Chaucer "in point of time, and in some respects of excellence." ² This combination of antiquarianism and enthusiasm for the "*North of England*" suggests a Scot rather than an Irishman, and an Irishman like Goldsmith.

If the trend of the evidence is definitely against Goldsmith's having written "The History of Our Own Language," it carries with it a doubt as to the authorship of the other two articles that later appeared in the *Bee*. Of these the essay "Of the Pride and Luxury of the Middling Class of People" ³ has been the least questioned of all the attributions in the *Literary Magazine*, and is perhaps the least questionable. ⁴ All that can be said for it, however, is that it is written in something like the personal style of Goldsmith; and even so the conclusion is rather more stiffly hortatory than we should expect from him. "I would earnestly recommend this adage," writes the author,

to every mechanick in London: "Keep your shop, Robin, and your shop will keep you." A strict observance of these words will, I am certain, gain them estates in time. Industry is the road to wealth, and honesty to happiness; and he who strenuously endeavours to pursue them both, may never fear the Critick's lash, or the sharp cries of penury and want.

Frugality, and even avarice, seem to have appealed to Goldsmith

¹ For Goldsmith's attitude towards this kind of writing, see the *Polite Learning* (Gibbs, iii, 471-472; cf. iv, 312).

² *Literary Magazine*, iii (February 1758), 56-58.

³ *Literary Magazine*, iii (May 1758), 209. See Gibbs, ii, 431-432.

⁴ The essay is transferred to the *Bee* with so little alteration that an analysis of the changes is not worth while.

rather more than industry,¹ and the maxims of frugality he usually took more personally to heart² than the writer of the foregoing passage seems to take his dictum. At any rate, the internal evidence yields no conclusive proof that Goldsmith wrote this essay originally, and the burden of proof rests with the affirmative rather than the negative.

The article with the running title, "Custom and Laws Compared"³ has not, so far as I know, been claimed for Goldsmith, but since it also appeared later, with few changes, in the *Bee*,⁴ it must be considered here. The *Bee* version is slightly expanded. Some two paragraphs are added at the beginning,⁵ and two at the end. Only one passage of any length is omitted.⁶ The general thesis of this

¹ In his letter to Henry Goldsmith, dated January 13, 1759, he writes, "Avarice in the lower orders of mankind is true ambition, avarice is the only ladder the poor can use to preferment. Preach, then, my dear Sir, to your son, not the excellence of human nature, nor the disrespect of riches, but endeavour to teach him thrift and œconomy" (*Collected Letters of Oliver Goldsmith* [Katharine C. Balderston, 1928], p. 61). The essays "On Justice and Generosity," "Upon Political Frugality," and "On Education," all likewise in the *Bee*, contain much more characteristic remarks on this general topic than the essay quoted above (see Gibbs, ii, 355, 381, 405).

² One reference to his letters has already been given. In another letter, addressed to Jane Lawder, he writes, "Instead of hanging my room with pictures I intend to adorn it with maxims of frugality, . . ." (*Collected Letters*, pp. 44-45). Cf. the *Citizen of the World*, Letters XXVII and C (Gibbs, iii, 105 and 365).

³ *Literary Magazine*, iii (July 1758), 315-316. It is introduced with the following letter addressed "To the Author of the LITERARY MAGAZINE."

"As the following excellent Observations upon a very curious and interesting subject made by a great Writer of our own nation now alive, are not in the hands of the Public, your inserting them in your Magazine cannot fail of obliging all your sensible Readers. I am,

"Yours, &c.
"D. O."

Very little significance can be attached to such a letter as this, but at least it does not point to Goldsmith.

⁴ See Gibbs, ii, 428-430.

⁵ The interpolation extends from the word "law" in the middle of the first sentence to the sentence beginning, "Custom, or the traditional observance of the practice of their forefathers, . . ."

⁶ The omitted passage follows directly after the observation of Chrysostom's (cf. Gibbs, ii, 428-429). It reads,

"This paradox [of Chrysostom's, 'That the enslav'd are the fittest to be governed by laws, and free men by custom'], ill understood by Merick Causabon, in whom I found it quoted, I shall endeavour to defend. Dio's politics here were directed principally upon Rome and her provinces. That at least it was a republic, and conquests made by it he had his eye upon, is evident from hence; conquer'd countries under a monarchy could with no propriety be said to be governed by laws; for the will of the monarch by the mouth of the lieutenant or bashaw is the terms of obedience; but in a free state the regular, debated decrees of the legislature afford them the benefit of fixed and established laws. So much for the fact. The reason on which Dio found [*sic*] his observation, may be gathered from hence:—Custom . . ."

paper, *That numerous laws are a sign of a degenerate community*, agrees indeed with one of Goldsmith's reiterated opinions.¹ But it happens that the thought is by no means unusual in eighteenth-century writings.² And when we consider the style in which the thought is set forth, we are far from Goldsmith's usual manner. Even the added paragraphs in the *Bee* version show little evidence of his hand. In the first group of these occurs, to be sure, the mention of Tacitus and Montesquieu, two names which he introduced into the *Polite Learning*,³ but the similarity ends there. In none of the added paragraphs do we find a direct echo of phrase or idea from the *Polite Learning*, such as can be traced in the "Augustan Age" paper. So far as the internal evidence goes, then, there is nothing to show that Goldsmith wrote even the *Bee* version.⁴ However that may be, there is certainly no trace of his accustomed style in the earlier version. The author, except in the one instance noted below, uses the editorial "we" throughout.⁵ He loads his paragraphs with classical allusion and quotation.⁶ He descants upon Dio Chrysostom's "noble observation, a paradox," says he, "ill understood by Merick Causabon, in whom I found it quoted, . . ." ⁷ By no test yet devised does this square with what we know of Goldsmith's style.

¹ In the *Polite Learning*, he quotes the following: "*Corruptissima republica, plurime leges.*—TACIT." (Gibbs, iii, 475). Cf. Gibbs, i, 282; iii, 190, 361; v, 355; *Series of Letters*, ii, 87.

² Cf. the *Dictionnaire d'Anecdotes* (1768), a work later found in Goldsmith's library, under "Législation": "La multiplicité des loix est le signe d'une foible législation." Cf. also *The Monitor, or British Freeholder*, for Saturday, February 4, 1758: "It was the observation of Tacitus, That a government could not give more sensible proofs of its declining state, than by multiplying laws, or making the old statutes and privileges to give way to new institutes." Random examples of this sort might be multiplied indefinitely.

³ Cf. the *Polite Learning* (Gibbs, iii, 475, 494) and the *Bee* (Gibbs, ii, 428).

⁴ It is not certain that Goldsmith wrote all the essays in the *Bee*. The "Percy Memoir" says that he "joined with some literary associates in a miscellaneous publication, called the 'Bee, being essays on the most interesting subjects,' printed for Wilkie, 1759" (*Miscellaneous Works*, [1806], i, 64); cf. Prior, i, 332-333.

⁵ For the significance of this fact, see *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, xxxix, 337-338. Miss Tupper says, in part, "An important piece of evidence which has been overlooked [?] by the editors is that the author of these essays [the "Belles Lettres" papers] uses consistently the editorial *we*, which Goldsmith never employed except in the reviews. . . . Among the attributions to Goldsmith in the Gibbs Edition the only exception to this personal form is in the Preface to the *Poetical Dictionary* which was probably not written by Goldsmith."

⁶ Cf. *ibid.* xxxix, 337. In one case the author meticulously gives the reference to the source of a quotation from "the Digests Tit. *De Ratione legis non inquirenda*": "L. 1. Tit. 3. L. 20 & 21." The quotation is copied in the *Bee* version (Gibbs, ii, 430, beginning "Non omnium quæ . . ."), but the reference is omitted.

⁷ This section is omitted from the *Bee* version. See above.

Of the three articles which later appeared in the *Bee*, then, only one, on the basis of internal evidence, can with any likelihood be attributed to Goldsmith, and even in that case the evidence is far from conclusive. The remaining attributions have less weight of authority behind them.

"The Poetical Scale" and the "Sequel to the Poetical Balance" ¹ owe their inclusion in the Goldsmith canon to Prior, who gives a rather long account of his reasons for including them,

As a matter of literary curiosity it may not be uninteresting to state the reasons why this paper ¹ is attributed to Goldsmith, although no certain evidence of the matter is known to exist or is likely now to be obtained.

These are, the use of a scale in reference to the merits of authors on another occasion, as in the preface to the *Citizen of the World*; similarity of opinion on the merits of our poets with those expressed in his avowed writings; the high standard of poetry assumed in both; the same opinion, incidentally introduced, of the merits of the disputants in the contest between Bentley and Boyle; the same account here as in his edition of Parnell of the origin of two of that poet's pieces; similar political opinions with Dr. Johnson, thence influencing his supposed opinion of Milton; the same preference here of Farquhar over Congreve, Vanburgh, and others, as always maintained by him in conversation and in writing. To these may be added the common evidence of style; the use as in all his essays, of the first person; the fact of his being then unacquainted with Johnson, who as having had connection with the Magazine, though not then engaged in it, might have known the writer, through the proprietor; the probability of its being his first introduction to Newbery, by whom he was afterwards so much employed; the general recollection of Mrs. Lawder that he had early drawn up some such essay; and the belief that he contributed more than one paper to this Magazine. [Prior then mentions the "Augustan Age in England," and "Of the Pride and Luxury of the Middling Class of People."] . . . The Poetical Scale and the Sequel were afterwards republished in the *Ladies' Magazine*, when he was connected with it.²

None of this is very convincing. It is hard to see why a humorous reference to a scale in the preface to the *Citizen of the World* ³ should constitute a parallel case. As to the contest between Bentley and Boyle, Prior's next specific point, the reference is probably to the *Polite Learning*. Goldsmith perhaps leans towards the side of the moderns as opposed to the ancients in that controversy,⁴ but nowhere does he reveal so complete an understanding of the superiority of

¹ *Literary Magazine*, iii. (January 1758), 6-8; (February 1758), 59-61. See Gibbs, iv, [417]-23, 423-428.

² I, 234-236. Prior evidently means to include both papers in his argument.

³ Gibbs, iii, [9].

⁴ Cf. Gibbs, iii, [529]-30.

Bentley over Boyle in the controversy about the "Epistles of Phalaris."¹ Again, that Goldsmith and the author of these papers should agree about the origin of two of Parnell's pieces is scarcely remarkable, since the question is one of fact rather than opinion or interpretation.² That Goldsmith, in common with the author of these papers, should prefer Farquhar to Congreve and Vanbrugh³ proves very little. It would indeed be remarkable if no one beside Goldsmith had held this opinion.⁴ The other points made by Prior hardly rise above the level of pure speculation.⁵ Gibbs adds very little evidence to Prior's. He finds parallels in "The History of Our Own Language"⁶ and in the "Belles Lettres" papers,⁷ none of which, in view of the evidence presented here, can help his cause. And the comparison which he suggests between the remarks in the

¹ Gibbs, iv, 421.

² See Gibbs, iv, 420 n.

³ The only explicit statement of this preference in Goldsmith's known writings occurs in the *Series of Letters*. Reviewing literature in the reign of George I, Goldsmith writes, "Farquhar is still more lively [than Congreve or Vanbrugh], and, perhaps, more entertaining than either; . . . his last play, intitled *The Beau* [sic.] *Stratagem*, being the best of these productions" (*Series of Letters*, ii, 139).

The "Sequel" reads: "Farquhar had a much truer comic genius than any of his contemporaries, but it was confin'd by his situation in life. With the same advantages that Vanburgh, Congreve, and Steel had, he could have written better than any of them, and there is an originality in his Sir Harry Wildair, that none of his coteremporaries have come up to in Comedy."

It will be noticed that Goldsmith's statement is much more tentative than the latter.

⁴ It is possible that Goldsmith first met with the opinion here. Gibbs noticed that he used "The History of Our Own Language" in the *Series of Letters* for his account of literature in the reign of Elizabeth (v, 308-309 and n.). Goldsmith may, therefore, have had the "Sequel" in mind when he wrote the literary summary of George I's reign in the same work (Letter XVI, *Series of Letters*, ii, 137-141. See previous note).

That Goldsmith, as late as 1764, seemed to need a model before him to guide him in the expression of literary opinion, is exemplified further in the case of the latter summary. For the general form of this he seems to have gone to a footnote in Smollett's *Complete History of England*. Smollett, for example, writes, "Berkeley, afterwards bishop of Cloyne in Ireland, surpassed his coteremporaries in subtlety and variety of metaphysical arguments, as well as in the art of deduction. . . ." (x [1759], 323 n.).

Goldsmith writes, "Berkeley, afterwards Bishop of Cloyne in Ireland, surpassed all his coteremporaries in subtlety of disquisition; . . ."

It is even possible that Smollett may have influenced his judgment of Farquhar. Smollett says, "Farquhar, who drew his pictures from fancy rather than from nature, and whose chief merit consists in the agreeable pertness and vivacity of his dialogue: . . ."

Goldsmith remarks, ". . . but he often mistakes pertness for wit, and seldom strikes his characters with proper force or originality."

⁵ The fact that both of these articles reappeared in the *Lady's Magazine* will be considered later.

⁶ IV, 421 n., 425 n.

⁷ IV, 427 n.

"Sequel" on Spenser and the review of Church's edition of Spenser, published in the *Critical Review* a year later, is even more damaging.¹ The additional argument which he builds up on the basis of the signatures appended to the articles in the *Literary Magazine* is equally unconvincing. "Both 'Crito' and 'Brito,'" he says,

appear as signatures to various papers in the *Literary Magazine* of 1758, and we think there are grounds for taking both to be signatures of Goldsmith. Besides being appended to the "Sequel," . . . "Crito" appears at the end of the tale "Phanor," . . . a piece much in Goldsmith's manner, and it is attached to some other articles.²

We shall take up the question of these signatures in the next paragraph. It is sufficient to observe here that neither Prior nor Gibbs³ have proved that Goldsmith wrote the "Poetical Scale" or the "Sequel."

"Phanor: or the Butterfly Pursuit, A Political Allegory"⁴ was included in the canon by Gibbs entirely on the basis of internal evidence, and hence has even less weight of authority behind it than the two foregoing essays. It follows "The Poetical Scale" in the magazine, and Gibbs noticed that it bears the signature "Crito." In this particular case, aside from the general undependability of such evidence, Gibbs's reasoning seems a trifle tortuous. He assigns to Goldsmith not only those articles signed "Crito"⁵ and "Brito,"⁶ but also some unsigned articles.⁷ As the range of signatures in the last volume of the magazine is limited, the choice of articles to be assigned to Goldsmith thus remains fairly wide. At any rate, "Phanor" and the "Sequel to the Poetical Balance," by having a common signature, are made to stand or fall together. And "Phanor" contributes nothing to the positive side of the account. It begins with an enthusiastic, if somewhat incoherent,

¹ Cf. Gibbs, iv, 423-424 and 333-337. It is, moreover, not certain that Goldsmith wrote even the review, for the attribution rests entirely on Prior's examination of the internal evidence (i, 316).

² IV, 514-515. Cf. iii, 458-459.

³ It has not seemed worth while to review all of Gibbs's notes. He remarks, at one point, that Otway, as in the "Sequel," is ranked after Shakespeare in the *Vicar* and in the *Series of Letters* (iv, 425 n.). The same explanation holds here as in the case of Farquhar. If there is any connection between these works, it is probable that the "Sequel" served as the source. The analogy he sees with the *Life of Parnell* (iv, 426 n.) is exceedingly weak. The rest of the notes have very little bearing on the problem.

⁴ *Literary Magazine*, iii (January 1758), 8-II. See Gibbs, iv, 429-436.

⁵ See iv, 514-515.

⁶ See iii, 458-459.

⁷ "The History of Our Own Times," "The Poetical Scale," "Of the Pride and Luxury of the Middling Class of People," "Custom and Laws Compared," are all unsigned.

defence of Shakespeare's learning, a subject over which we should not expect to find Goldsmith waxing warm.¹ Thence it moves with some violence to the version of the story of Atalanta, supposed to have been found amongst the ruins of Herculaneum. This story leads in turn to a discussion of the tendency of the English to butterfly pursuits. "A certain friend of mine," writes the author, "who is about forty years of age, has drawn up a kind of an almanac of all the butterfly pursuits of the people of *England* for these twenty years past, and they appear as thick in it as the saints in a popish kalendar." The whims recorded, of course, go back to a period much earlier than the date of Goldsmith's arrival in London,² and may indicate that the article in the *Literary Magazine* was copied from one of a still earlier vintage. There is no evidence to show that Goldsmith had even read this article.³

The paper "On the Character of English Officers" ⁴ is another of Gibbs's attributions. He prints it as a companion piece to "The Bravery of the English Common Soldiers," which Prior, in spite of Boswell's assigning it to Johnson, claimed for Goldsmith.⁵ Gibbs argues for the first of these articles largely on the strength of the signature "Brito," which it has in common with the first section of "The History of Our Own Language."⁶ Such an argument by this time needs no rebuttal. Nor does the rest of Gibbs's evidence warrant serious consideration. Goldsmith, he notices, speaks of the "valour (questionable) of the officers of his time," in Letter LXXXV of the *Citizen of the World*,⁷ and he finds that

¹ Cf. the review of Coxeter's edition of Massinger's works (*Critical Review*, viii [July 1759], 87).

² The author also speaks of having seen "Old Shippen" in the House of Commons. If he refers, as Gibbs suggests, to William Shippen, that member's last recorded address in parliament seems to have occurred in 1741 (see Gibbs, iv, 435 n.; see also iv, 433-434 and n.).

³ It is significant that the parallels which Gibbs points out for the discussion of *Macbeth* in this essay occur in the "Belles Lettres" papers and the "Sequel to the Poetical Balance" (iv, 429 n.).

⁴ *Literary Magazine*, iii (March 1758), 105-109. See Gibbs, iii, 450-457.

⁵ See Prior, i, 349-350. Prior contradicts Boswell's statement that "The Bravery of the English Common Soldiers," first published in the *British Magazine* for January 1760, was added to the *Idler* by Johnson when that work was "collected in volumes" (see *Life of Johnson* [New York], i, 388); "nor," says Prior, "is it to be found in the early editions of that work; . . ."

This essay, "An Essay on Epitaphs," and "A Dissertation on the Epitaphs Written by Pope," appear as "Additional Essays" in the third edition of the *Idler* (1767).

⁶ See Gibbs, iii, 457-459. The argument cannot have much force unless the "Language" papers are accepted as Goldsmith's.

⁷ Gibbs, iii, 459.

passage analogous to the theme of this article. The name "Talbot" occurring in the sequence "the Talbots, Salisburys, the Mowbrays,"¹ reminds him of the "curious account of 'old James Talbot,'" in the "Boar's Head Tavern" essay.² The account of the conduct of "David Gam, a valiant Welshman," under Henry V at Agincourt,³ Gibbs compares with a somewhat similar account of the battle in the *Series of Letters*, a passage taken from Rapin.⁴ Another vague reference to the *Series of Letters* and one to "The History of Our Own Language"⁵ complete the tale of the analogous passages Gibbs is able to find. As for the essay itself, it breathes a spirit of aristocratic militarism completely foreign to the political philosophy that Goldsmith develops elsewhere. "The sword," writes the author of this paper,

is the noblest as well as the most antient tenure of possession. . . . The liberties of *England* can be safe only in the hands of *Englishmen*, and formerly, military command was always proportioned to actual property, on this presumption, that, the more a party possesses, the greater is his interest, and the stronger will be his endeavours to protect and defend it.

The author of "The Deserted Village" would have hardly given the landlord class so much comfort as that.⁶

So far, then, neither the evidence hitherto presented by editors and biographers, nor the internal evidence to be gleaned from each separate paper, fully supports any of the attributions to Goldsmith in the *Literary Magazine*. The ascertainable facts are these: three of the papers in the magazine were later published, in whole or in part, in the *Bee* during November 1759;⁷ two reappeared in the

¹ Gibbs, iii, 452 and n.

² See Gibbs, i, 287-289. "Old James Talbot" is there represented as one of the later proprietors of the tavern.

³ Gibbs, iii, 452 and n.

⁴ Cf. *Series of Letters*, i, 165, and Rapin's *History of England*, iv (1757), 227.

⁵ III, 452 and n.

⁶ In the *Series of Letters* he says that at the time of Magna Charta this aristocracy "were all, in reality, enemies to public liberty . . . so many factions in the nation, subversive of the rights of mankind: . . ." (i, 97). And in the "Political View" he sees war as valuable because it breaks up a "long continuance of property in the same channel," and "gives a circulation to the wealth of a nation, the poor have many opportunities of bettering their fortune, and the rich must labour in order to support the necessary expences required in defraying it. Thus all are in action, and emulative industry is the parent of every national virtue" (From the MS. See Gibbs, v, 9).

⁷ The *Bee* papers are: "Custom and Laws Compared" and "Of the Pride and Luxury of the Middling Class of People" (November 17, 1759), and "An Account of the Augustan Age of England" (November 24, 1759).

Lady's Magazine for January and April 1761¹; four articles, three of which Goldsmith could not have written, contributed material to the "Political View"²; three *Public Ledger* papers show traces of having been influenced by Johnson's articles in the magazine³; the summary of literature during the reign of Elizabeth, in the *Series of Letters*, owes something to "The History of Our Own Language." Goldsmith, therefore, apparently knew the *Literary Magazine* and made use of it from November 1759 until at least 1763, when he was writing his *Series of Letters*. But is it necessary to suppose that he had anything to do with it before November 1759?

It will be remembered that the *Literary Magazine*,⁴ together with the *Bee* and the *Lady's Magazine*, was at least in part a venture of Wilkie's. The hypothesis, therefore, suggests itself that Goldsmith (possibly through one of his associates in the *Bee*) came upon a file of the *Literary Magazine* for the first time in Wilkie's shop, when he was in need of material for the *Bee*. There is no certain evidence to connect Goldsmith and Wilkie before the *Lady's Magazine* began to appear in September 1759. Furthermore, there is no certain evidence that between November 1757⁵ and December 1758⁶ he contributed anything to any periodical.⁷ It is undoubtedly to fill up this gap in his periodical writings that the attributions in the *Literary Magazine* were originally made.⁸ But perhaps the gap does not require filling. There is reason to believe that after having

¹ The "Poetical Scale" and the "Sequel to the Poetical Balance," see ii, [252]-256, [260-264], 389-393.

² These are: "An Introduction to the Political State of Great Britain," "Observations on the Present State of Affairs," "Of the Constitution of the German Empire," and "The History of Our Own Times."

³ The *Citizen of the World*, Letters XVII (first published, March 13, 1760), xxxv (May 12, 1760), and xcvi (November 28, 1760).

⁴ The last two volumes bear Wilkie's name on the title-page. The imprint on the title-page of the first volume (of the Yale Library set) reads, "Printed for J. Richardson in *Pater-noster Row*," and that on the following page (which sets forth the principal contents) reads, "Printed for W. Faden, in Wine Office-Court, Fleet-Street. MDCCLVI." It is thus not clear what authority Prior had for associating Newbery's name with the magazine (see i, 233-236). There is, moreover, nothing to show that relations between Goldsmith and Newbery were established before 1760.

⁵ See the review of Massey's translation of Ovid's *Fasti*, published in the *Critical Review* (Gibbs, iv, 300-303 and n.).

⁶ See Prior, i, 283-285. Four of Goldsmith's reviews appear in the *Monthly Review* for this month.

⁷ Prior suggests (i, 255-258) that he contributed during this period to the *Grand Magazine of Universal Intelligence*, which began in January 1758, but there is no clear trace of his hand in this periodical.

⁸ See Prior, i, 231-232, and Gibbs, v, 59 n.

escaped from his "thralldom" under Griffiths his energies were not directed principally towards literature. He may, as Prior suggests,¹ have gone back to Dr. Milner's school. He probably gave a certain amount of attention to the practice of physic. In a letter written in December 1757 to Daniel Hodson, he says,

I suppose you desire to know my present situation, a[nd since] there is nothing in it, at which I should blush, or mankind [could censure, I] see no reason for making it a secret; in short, by a v[ery little] practice as a Physician and a very little reputation a[s an author] I make a shift to live.²

Moreover, it has recently been shown³ that from 1757 until at least as late as January 1759, his mind was occupied with the prospect of going as a physician to the coast of Coromandel. And the one literary work to which he seems to have given most of his spare time and attention during the year 1758,⁴ was written to raise funds for the voyage thither.⁵ So that possibly no one has been able to find any satisfactory example of Goldsmith's periodical writings between November 1757 and December 1758, because during that period he published none.⁶

¹ I, 258.

² *Collected Letters of Oliver Goldsmith* (Balderston, 1928), 27-28. The brackets indicate conjectural readings. It is interesting to notice that while "author" is probably the correct reading (Percy [*Miscellaneous Works*, 1806, i, 41] reads "poet"), it is conjectural, while "Physician" is not.

³ By Professor K. C. Balderston. See *Collected Letters*, pp. xxx-xxxiii.

⁴ *The Polite Learning*. He wrote to Edward Mills, in August 1758, "The book is now printing in London, . . ." (*ibid.* 34-35). Since the book was not published until April 2, 1759, this is probably not true; but it indicates at least that he had been working on the book before that time.

⁵ See the letter to Daniel Hodson, dated August 1758 (*ibid.* 49-52). The other well-authenticated attributions to Goldsmith during this year are: the *Memoirs of a Protestant*, published in February 1758; four reviews written for Griffiths and published in the *Monthly Review* for December 1758; a life of Voltaire, which though not advertised until February 1759, was probably partly written in December 1758 (see *ibid.* pp. 56, 63).

The first of these may have constituted the literary work to which he refers in the letter quoted in the text above. The four reviews, and probably also the life of Voltaire (but see *ibid.* p. 63 n.), seem to have been part of a transaction with Griffiths in connection with his appearing before the examiners for the post of hospital mate on a man-of-war (see Prior, i, 279-286). This post, it has been shown (see *Collected Letters*, xxx-xxxii), was to afford him passage to India. Thus all his known writings during 1758, with the exception of the *Memoirs of a Protestant*, apparently owed their existence to some emergency in connection with that venture.

⁶ It is not certain when, after his first contribution in November 1758, he resumed contributing to the *Critical Review*. It should also be remembered that he mentioned the "Chinese Philosopher" in a letter to Robert Bryanton, dated August 14, 1758, and hence was probably already planning the *Chinese Letters*, which began in the *Public Ledger* in January, 1760 (see *Collected Letters*, pp. 39 and n.-40).

THE PRETERITE IN NORTH-WESTERN DIALECTS

BY S. O. ANDREW

At an early date the preterite of strong verbs was levelled under the singular type in the Northern dialects, from which it gradually spread in the M.E. period to the literary language, where it has maintained itself to the present day. We should naturally assume that in the dialects which resisted this tendency the alternative process would take place and that, when simplification began, the preterite would be levelled under the plural type. As is well known, there are some difficulties about this view and it has not been accepted by modern scholars; Professor Wyld, for example, in his *Short History of English*, follows Bülbring in attributing the "Western" preterite to the influence, not of the preterite plural, but of the past participle, on the ground that while many of the forms may be explained equally well in either way, others (like *fought*) point to the participle rather than the preterite. It is the object of this article to examine the evidence, so far as the North-Western dialects are concerned.

It will be convenient to begin with the strong verbs in Classes IV and V, where the examples are numerous and the facts are least ambiguous, and to confine ourselves in the first instance to indubitably North-Western texts. In the *A.P.* and *Sir Gawain* we have the following forms (the numbers are those of the examples found):

bidde :	<i>sing.</i> : bed 5, bede 19	
	<i>pl.</i> : bede 2, beden 2	(<i>p.p.</i> beden, boden)
bere :	<i>sing.</i> : ber 2, bere 3	
	<i>pl.</i> : ber 1, bere 1	(<i>p.p.</i> borne)
breke :	<i>sing.</i> : brek 2, breke 1	
	<i>pl.</i> : brek 1, breke 1, breken 2	(<i>p.p.</i> broken)
ete :	<i>sing.</i> : ete 2, ette 1	
gete :	<i>sing.</i> : gete 1	
	<i>pl.</i> : geten 1	(<i>p.p.</i> geten)
	(forȝet 1, forȝete 1, forȝate 2, all <i>sing.</i>)	

gif :	<i>sing.</i> : gef 10, gafe 1	
	<i>pl.</i> : gef 1	(<i>p.p.</i> geven)
heve :	<i>sing.</i> : hef 4	
	<i>pl.</i> : hef 1, heven 1	(<i>p.p.</i> heven)
lyze :	<i>sing.</i> : le3 2, lay 5	
	<i>pl.</i> : lyze 2, lezen 1	(<i>p.p.</i> leyen)
nyme :	<i>sing.</i> : nome 2, nem 2	
	<i>pl.</i> : nome 2, neme 1	(<i>p.p.</i> nomen, nummen)
schere :	<i>pl.</i> : scher 1	(<i>p.p.</i> schorne)
se :	<i>sing.</i> : se3 segh 4, sy3 1, syze 1	
	<i>pl.</i> : se3 1, se3e 1, se3en 1, syze 4	(<i>p.p.</i> sene)
sitte :	<i>sing.</i> : set 1, seet 1, sete 5, sate 1	
	<i>pl.</i> : sete 5, seten 3	(<i>p.p.</i> seten)
speke :	<i>sing.</i> : spek 1, speke 2	
	<i>pl.</i> : speke 1, spoken 1	(<i>p.p.</i> spoken)
steke :	<i>sing.</i> : stek 1, stac 1	
	<i>pl.</i> : steken 1	(<i>p.p.</i> stoken)
stete :	<i>sing.</i> : stel 2	
	<i>pl.</i> : stel 1, stelen 1	(<i>p.p.</i> stollen)
swere :	<i>sing.</i> : swere 1	(<i>p.p.</i> sworne)
were :	<i>sing.</i> : wer 2, were 1	
wreke :	<i>sing.</i> : wre3 1, wrak 1	

Some of these verbs have changed their class, *e.g.* heve and swere which have moved from II (Sweet's classification); and some of the examples credited to bidde may belong to bede. But in all the forms given, apart from the six singular types (gafe, sate, etc.) some of which are due to exigencies of rhyme, no distinction appears to be made between singular and plural and all of them are possible plurals. There is certainly nothing to suggest any general confusion with the past participle; the only doubt that can arise is in regard to the length and quality of the vowel in the preterites of the Class V verbs, which are naturally similar in form to the past participles. Is the vowel of these preterites long or short, open or close?

Fortunately, we have evidence for both classes in rhyming works written in the North-Western dialect, for besides *Pearl* belonging to the *A.P.* group itself, we have the Chester Plays going back to a date quite as early, though in their present form they are a sixteenth-century transliteration. What have the rhymes in these works to tell us?

<i>Pearl</i>	23 : gef <i>rh.</i> : lef, bref
	60 : bede <i>rh.</i> : rede, yede
	59 : nem <i>rh.</i> : Jherusalem
	70 : sete <i>rh.</i> : swete, mete (= meet)
	59 : segh hit <i>rh.</i> : justifyet

- C.P. iv, 456 : bade *rh.* : seede
 v, 60 : bade (D bede) *rh.* : neede
 xi, 131 : bade *rh.* : nede, deed
 xiv, 284 : beare *rh.* : theer
 xvi, 446 : beare *rh.* : weer
 xxiv, 401 : bare (B bere) *rh.* : lere
 xiv, 101 : geet *rh.* : feet, weet
 xxii, 17 : geet *rh.* : leet, feet
 xxiv, 348 : swear (W swere) *rh.* : yere
 xxiv, 671 : forswear *rh.* : here, (withouten) were
 xvi, 116 : were *rh.* : dere

I may add that the rhymes in *Awntyrs of Arthur* and *Pistil of Susan*, which I have given grounds for supposing to be North-Western works, give *ête* (*A.A.* xxv, *rh.* swete), *sē* (*P.S.* 316, *rh.* tre), *swēre* (*P.S.* 165, *rh.* here).

All these rhymes certify a long close vowel, except for the curious form *nem*, in which the sound appears to be open. There is some difficulty in regard to the vowel of *segh* : I cannot help feeling that before *z* the vowel was a very close *ē*, so close as to permit rhyming with *y* of French origin. In *G.* *syze* rhymes with *crye*, and *leze lyze*, *deze dyze*, *dreze dryze*, etc., are written indifferently : that the vowel in these words was *ē* is shown by the form in which they have survived in the modern folk-speech of Lancashire, and we actually have the form *sē* in *P.S.*, certified by rhyme. It seems, therefore, a good conclusion that in Classes IV and V of the strong verbs the plural type of the preterite with a long close *e* was the prevailing one in the North-Western dialects, and that the preterite was kept quite distinct from the past participle.

We may now go on to examine the other classes of strong verbs for evidence of confusion between the preterite and the participle. In I and II the stem of the preterite singular and plural is the same, and it is therefore unnecessary to give examples of both. We have the following *p.t.* and *p.p.* forms occurring in the *A.P.* group : *fel* fallen, *helde* halden, *wex* (wax 1) waxen, *lep* lopen, *blwe* blawen, [*ferde*] *faren*, *slowe* slayn, *schop* schapen, *droze* drawn. *Walt* (*p.t.* of *welde*), which comes twice in *G.*, looks at first sight like a participial form, but is probably due to analogy. In III preterites and participles are usually not distinguishable, *e.g.* *fonde* founden *p.t.*, *funde* founden *p.p.* In the few cases where it is possible the forms are distinguished, *e.g.* *zelde* *p.t.*, *s.* and *pl.*, *zolden* *p.p.*, and perhaps *barst* *p.t.*, *bursten* *p.p.*, *brusten* *p.p.*, *corven* *p.t.pl.*

(*Pat.* 153) might be taken as a participial form, but the spelling is ambiguous. In VI the usual singular preterites are *bode*, *bote*, *drof*, etc. ; where the plural form occurs it is, of course, indistinguishable from the participle, e.g. *byden p.t.* *biden p.p.* In VII we have *flete p.t.* *floten p.p.*, *leke p.t.* *loken p.p.*, *ches chosen p.t.* *chosen p.p.*, *schot p.t.* *schoten p.p.* The difficulties in regard to *chose* and *schote* are well known and make it unsafe to build any argument upon them. The evidence generally, therefore, in all these classes of verbs, as in the two already examined, is against the supposition that there was any tendency in this dialect to confuse the preterite and the past participle.

Let us now examine more particularly the preterite forms and see whether they encourage any such suspicion of instability in the Preterite-plural type as has sometimes been expressed. As we have already seen, the plural type, so far from being unstable in Classes IV and V, has almost entirely superseded the singular in those classes. What is the evidence for the other classes? In I and II there is of course no difference between the singular and plural types. In III almost every preterite has its proper plural by the side of the singular, e.g. *clamb clomben*, *ran runnen*, *wan wonnen*, *drank dronken*, *carf corven*, *brast bursten*, *songe songen*, etc. Of VI very few plurals happen to occur ; we have *byden* (*Cl.* 1243) and *smeten* (*G.* 1763), while *bode* and *stroke* are both singular and plural. In VII there are *beden*, *chosen*, *cloven*, *flowen* (beside the singulars *bede*, *ches*, *clef*, *flaze*), as well as *bowen* and *schowen*. *Flaze* and *lut* (if a strong *p.t.*), though singulars, are plural types.

There is nothing in all this to lead us to suppose that the Preterite-plural type was not a thriving one. It kept its place however and did not invade the territory of the singular type. From its behaviour in Classes IV and V, we might have expected that it would do so. Language, however, does not work in this logical way, and what happened was a little less simple. Most of the verbs in Classes IV and V are those in very common use, and it would seem as though the *ē* of their preterite tense, once established, came to be regarded as the natural vowel for a strong preterite in any class of verb, wherever analogy could suggest or support it. There are many examples of these *ē*-preterites outside Classes IV and V.

Sometimes the *ē* is the normal vowel not of the plural but of the singular ; in that case the singular type survives, e.g. *leke* (*G.* 1830),

flete (*G.* 1566), tez (*D.T.*), bede (beodan) (this no doubt explains why bede in the dialect is the preterite both of bidde and of bede; it is normal for bidde, while the *ē* has preserved the singular type for bede). Sometimes an old strong preterite is simply kept, *e.g.* lete, sweze (*G.* 1796) swe (*Cleanness* 956), lep (*Patience* 179), feng (*G.* 646), in preference to the prevailing weak one; sometimes one is invented, *e.g.* wer (*Cleanness* 69) from the weak were = defend. In other cases, mere analogy has been at work, *e.g.* smeten (*G.* 1763), wrethen (*P.S.* 55), strekyn (*D.T.* 7786, etc.), dreze (= drew, *W.A.* 3629), stize beside steȝid (*W.A.* 3467). Some of these are ambiguous and may be spellings of smiten, writhen, etc., but streek occurs in the modern dialect. Dreze is put down by *N.E.D.* to scribal error or confusion with dree; it occurs twice in *W.A.*, and the other examples given above suggest rather analogy with forms like seten, quethen, speken, seze. Analogy also affected weak verbs, even of French origin, and we have strong preterites like skepe, chefe, etc.; these are usually explained as apocopated weak preterites, but scope among others was a common Tudor form, and the explanation given seems preferable. All the evidence seems to prove quite clearly that while the *ē*-preterite was the rule in the Middle-English North-Western dialects for certain classes of verbs, there was a tendency to extend it by analogy to verbs in which there was no good historical ground for it; so far as I have observed, it is not found on this large scale in any but North-Western texts, and may therefore be accepted as an additional test of dialect for that region.

We may now ask whether our conclusions are confirmed by the evidence of the modern folkspeech. Some of the verbs under consideration have become obsolete, a few have adopted a weak conjugation, but generally speaking the usage of the modern dialect agrees with that already established for its Middle-English ancestor. The following forms still survive: breck (brokn), beer (born), eet (etn), geet (getn), lee (leen), leep (loppen), leet (letten), seet (sitten), speak (spokn) (spok is from the literary language). Most of these (see *E.D.D.*) are confined to the North-West. And we have written evidence which carries us two centuries back in the works of Tim Bobbin (John Collier, b. 1708); they are poor stuff as literature, but a good linguistic document. Collier has all the forms given above and the following in addition: heeve, see, sweer, treed ("bigger scoundrel never treed o' brogue"); of these, treed (*p.p.* tredn) confirms the "fortreed" of the *Chester Plays*, and

heeve (*p.p.* hovn) and sweer are the two most striking instances found in *Sir Gawain* of verbs that have shifted their class.

A few words may be added about the preterite of *fight* in this dialect. Decisive examples unfortunately are wanting in the *A.P.* group; we have *fozt p.t. pl.* (if it is the right reading) in *G.* 874 and *faght metri gratia* in *Pearl*. *Fazt* is naturally the form in *M.A.* and *W.A.*, while *D.T.* has the ambiguous plural forms, *foghten*, *foughten*. The modern dialect has [*faut*] *p.t.*, [*fautn*] *p.p.*, of which the preterite might be the descendant of the plural type. The sound of the diphthong is, however, not the same as that of *ou* from *ū*, and I fancy that in any case the guttural would have preserved the *ū*. The explanation of the two modern forms may be quite simple. "Fight" is the only word of its kind in its class, and it is well known that such isolated words are peculiarly vulnerable and usually defend themselves by joining a group. I suspect that the preterite and participle of *fight* joined the group *brozt*, *sozt*, *wrozt*, etc.; the pronunciation of the vowel in the modern dialect is the same, *i.e.* [*ou*].

Lastly, I may add that though I have not examined carefully more southerly Western texts, I have observed in the *St. Katharine* group the preterite forms *brek*, *hef*, *bed*, *zef*, *sete*, *biseh*, *spek*, all singular. These look like the plural types for which evidence has been given from North-Western writings. There are a few of the same types in some MSS. of *Piers Plowman*, but it would perhaps be rash to attempt to draw evidence from that work until the various texts have been classified and published in their entirety.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

DEFOE'S CONNECTIONS WITH THE *EDINBURGH COURANT*

THE question of Defoe's connections with the *Edinburgh Courant* during the early part of 1710 was definitely cleared up by W. J. Couper in 1908. Previous to the publication of Couper's study,¹ it was generally known by students of Defoe that Defoe had an interest in the paper, but Couper was the first to clearly establish the fact that he actually wrote for it. It may not be amiss to summarise Couper's findings.

On February 1, 1710, the Edinburgh Town Council gave permission to Daniel Defoe to print the *Edinburgh Courant* in place of the deceased Adam Boige "discharging hereby any other person to print news under the name of the *Edinburgh Courant*." Seven weeks, however, elapsed before Defoe brought out his first issue, during which interval a paper was circulated bearing the same name and having the same format as Boige's paper. By March 20 Defoe was ready with his first issue, emphasising his sole legal right to the use of the name by publishing under the title "Published By Authority." The rival paper, which also appeared on the same day, realising that Defoe did not intend to be deprived of his rights, changed its title to that of the *Scots Courant*. Defoe, it appears, published only two issues—the first on March 20 and the second on March 23—copies of which issues may be found in the National Library of Scotland.

But there are reasonable grounds for the contention that Defoe was contributing to the *Edinburgh Courant* before the death of Boige. That he had more than a passing interest in the paper is strongly suggested by his haste in petitioning the Town Council to allow him to use Boige's title; for Boige died on January 27, 1710, and the Town Council acted on Defoe's application on February 1, 1710.

¹ *The Edinburgh Periodical Press.*

Belief that he may have written for the *Edinburgh Courant* before 1710 is strengthened when it is remembered that after he transferred his services to Godolphin at the fall of the Harleian ministry, he was early in 1708 sent back to Scotland and remained in Edinburgh for the most part until the Spring of 1710; and that, despite the fact that the nature of his mission in Scotland called for a fair amount of journalistic activity, we have, according to Professor Trent, "no full account of his labours for his new chief."¹ Certainly the preparation of the *History of the Union* consumed much of his time; but even so, Defoe realised that his main business in Scotland was to keep an eye on suspected Scotch Jacobites and in every way possible advocate and defend the policies of Godolphin. From a careful reading of the *Edinburgh Courant* for 1708 and 1709, I am of the opinion that Defoe found it more convenient to carry out such a programme by secretly using the columns of a well-established and highly-respected Scotch paper.

Internal evidence would seem to indicate that he began to contribute to the *Edinburgh Courant* in October 1708 and continued to write for it off and on until December 1709. In examining the subject-matter of the passages which I have ascribed to him, I am unable to find any utterances which would not be in keeping with his peculiar relations to the Godolphin ministry. Further support is given to the assumption that these sections were written by Defoe by the presence of many of his characteristic expressions, such as, "I say," "I presume no man can doubt," "those who have had the conduct," "I shall not offer to enquire into," "but I presume to say," "easy to imagine," "the great noise they made about it," "but it must be owned," "it was not so much as doubted," "take all possible care," "true account," "it appears very plain," (etc.).

The short article, "Anent the Pope's intermeddling betwixt the House of Austria and Bourbon," which appeared in No. 498, November 5, 1708, was in all probability written by Defoe. The views expressed concerning the Pope of Rome, as well as the stylistic features, offer a reasonably safe basis for ascribing it to him. The following extract is typical:

But to keep close to what I am about, the Pope's early and heady acknowledgement of King Philip V has been the root of more mischief to the common cause than is easy to imagine. And had he since given no open instances of further partiality, yet let no man consider the bigotry

¹ *Cambridge History of English Literature*, vol. ix.

of the Spanish nation, the number of ecclesiastics spread through that country and all the other parts of the Spanish dominions, let him also consider what a refin'd machine the Roman hierarchy is, how strong, yet how secret its wheels, how much yet how imperceptibly actuated by its head, let him but add to this the natural impulse the Pope must feel to promote for his own sake the part which he unjustly own'd, that he must fall under the vengeance he must dread, because so much deserved from the other, should it prevail ; I say let these things be considered and I presume no man can doubt that those who have had the conduct of the consciences of King Charles' subjects have made as dangerous a war against us as those who have led his enemy's armies, nor need I say with what success, or if I needed them look far for instances ; the War of Ghent and Bruges flash it full in our eyes.

Further evidences of his hand are recognisable in the series of papers on the " Proceedings of the Allies," beginning with No. 517, December 20, 1708, and extending through No. 523, January 2, 1709. It is likewise probable that he wrote the two spirited accounts on the collapse of the French expedition for No. 523, January 2, and No. 524, January 10, 1709. A short passage from No. 524 will serve as an example of his style :

What grounds they had for making this expedition public in such an unusual manner, I shall not offer to enquire into, but I presume to say, that it appears very plain that they had an encouragement to venture upon so great an enterprise with a handfull of men, or that they designed by that expedition and the great noise they made about it to kindle a civil war in Britain or at least to oblige the Queen to recall most of her forces from the Netherlands, and keep at home the fleet under Sir John Leake designed for the support of King Charles in the Straights which would have opened a way for the French to have recovered the Spanish Netherlands wherein they had friends to second their designs, insult the frontiers of the Dutch, and dispose them to a separate peace, while the Elector of Bavaria was to penetrate into Germany and the Duke of Orleans to invade Catalonia where King Charles was reduced to such straits that Barcelona itself had been in danger had the Confederate fleet been hindered by their intended diversion from bringing any success from Italy to that Prince. This it seems was the project of the enemy in the beginning of the campaign, the reason why the Duke of Burgundy was sent to command in the Netherlands and the grounds of their expectation on that account ; but God was pleased to baffle all their great designs and inspired her Majesty with such a resolution and conduct that the projects of the enemy have turned to their own shame and destruction.

After giving an account of the " State of the War " in No. 528, January 1709, Defoe was apparently silent until May 8, when he perhaps contributed the rather lengthy article on the " Proceedings

between France and the Allies," No. 596, July 1; relating the weakened condition of the French seems to have been his next contribution. Readers of Defoe's journalistic prose will doubtless recognise the familiar features of Defoe's prose in the following passage selected from this number.

We have had hitherto few opportunities to write because the enemies take all possible care to stop our carriers that people may not have a true account of the transactions of these parts of the world; and that they may publish thereof whatever they may think may serve their interests. We have intercepted several letters from their camp whereby we have learned a great many things concerning our own affairs to which we were altogether strangers. And it must be owned that they very much outdo us in two particulars, viz. Running and Lying. Wherever they have through the swiftness of their feet saved part of their troops, they reckon it as a victory, but it is an undeniable matter of fact that they have not in any action obtained the advantage this must be understood, since the action with General Lewenbaupt, and if what they write was true, we should at this time have no army, nor even one soldier left. We are, however, so bold as to follow them as close to their heels without being able to oblige them to make a stand, so that this war is properly a chase of hunting. We have followed our game about 250 leagues, and if their arms had been able to stop us, as they give out, they would not have burnt and destroyed their own country as they have done. In a word, there is nothing more contrary to truth than their letters, and I could not read them without admiring their confidence.

Equally convincing is the evidence for ascribing to Defoe the accounts of the "State of the War" which appeared in the issues for September 12, 14, and 16, 1709; and the series on the "State of the War with the Dutch," beginning with No. 665, December 9, 1709, and ending with No. 669, December 21, 1709. The frequency with which he apparently contributed to the *Edinburgh Courant* immediately preceding the death of Boige would seem to explain his continued interest in the paper and his desire to gain full control of it at Boige's death. And doubtless the *Edinburgh Courant* under his management would have had a longer life had not the difficulties in which the Godolphin ministry were involved necessitated his speedy return to London.

CHARLES EATON BURCH.

Howard University,
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

A CRITICISM OF POPE'S "MOONLIGHT SCENE" IN THE *QUARTERLY REVIEW*

IN a lengthy footnote to Chapter 2 of the *Biographia Literaria* Coleridge relates that, in the course of one of his lectures, he demonstrated the falsity of Pope's imagery in the translation of the *Iliad* in a manner which made a "sudden and evident" impression on the audience. He adds: "Among other passages, I analysed sentence by sentence, and almost word by word, the popular lines,

As when the moon, resplendent lamp of night,¹ etc.

much in the same way as has been since done, in an excellent article on Chalmers's British Poets in the *Quarterly Review*."

The three editors of the *Biographia* have been strangely unsuccessful in tracing the article to which Coleridge thus gave his approval. In Henry Nelson Coleridge's edition of 1847 we read:

The article to which the Author refers was written by Mr. Southey, and may be found in Vol. XI of the *Quarterly Review*, p. 480. But it contains nothing corresponding to Mr. Coleridge's remark, whose reference is evidently mistaken.

Mr. Shawcross's comment, in the Oxford edition of 1907, is to the same effect. Mr. George Sampson, in his edition of 1920, quotes H. N. Coleridge's note in its entirety and without comment.

A fact which seems to have escaped notice is that the *Quarterly Review* published two articles entitled "Chalmers's *English Poets*," both written by Southey.² The first, to which Coleridge's editors refer, appeared in July 1814. The second appeared in the succeeding number, dated October 1814, and will be found in Vol. XII. In this article Southey traverses the whole course of English literature from Chaucer to his own day, but digresses to the extent of two pages for the purpose of analysing selected lines and couplets from Pope's *Iliad*. The concluding paragraph, referring particularly to the "moonlight scene," is as follows:

Here are the planets rolling round the moon; here is the pole gilt and glowing with stars; here are trees made yellow and mountains tipt

¹ The reading *light*, in the Oxford edition of the *Biographia*, is, apparently, a misprint.

² See the *Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey*, edited by his son (1850), vol. vi, p. 400.

with silver by the moonlight ; and here is the whole sky in a flood of glory ; appearances not to be found either in Homer or in nature ; finally these gilt and glowing skies, at the very time when they are thus pouring forth a flood of glory, are represented as a blue vault ! The astronomy in these lines would not appear more extraordinary to Dr. Herschell than the imagery to every person who has observed moonlight scenes.

This passage, as I think most readers will agree, may justly be described as "corresponding to Mr. Coleridge's remark."

P. L. CARVER.

AN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ORIGINAL FOR LAMB?

In the British Museum are preserved two copies of a small pamphlet, consisting of some thirty pages, entitled *A Learned Dissertation on Dumpling, Its Dignity, Antiquity and Excellence ; with a word upon Pudding*. The precise date of composition of this work it is all but impossible to ascertain, for the earliest copy which the British Museum possesses is the fifth edition, published in 1726. The seventh edition appeared in the next year. If the proximity in date of these two can be taken as any indication of the measure of popularity which the pamphlet enjoyed, it would seem that we are fairly safe in assuming that the first edition was not published much earlier than 1724. As there is no name on the title-page of either copy it is rather a delicate matter to assign an author to the piece, but evidence which is not altogether without weight would point to its being the work of Henry Carey (d. 1743), the author of the well-known ballad of *Sally in Our Alley*, and the burlesque tragedy *Chrononhotonthologos*. To both of the extant editions of the pamphlet is added Carey's poem *Namby Pamby*, published in 1725 as a skit upon some verses addressed by Ambrose Phillips to the infant daughter of Lord Carteret, though in each case it is printed anonymously, while at the foot of a folio sheet containing Carey's song *Mocking is Catching*,¹ published in 1726, the sixth edition of *A Learned Dissertation on Dumpling* is advertised as having been lately published. Some interest, too, attaches to the booksellers for whom it was printed : J. Roberts, E. Nutt, A. Dodd, and

¹ A satire on the departure from England of the Italian opera-singer, Senesino. It appeared in *The Musical Century* (1740) under the title *A Sorrowful Lamentation for the Loss of a Man and No Man*.

N. Blandford. The names of Dodd and Nutt both appear on the title-page of *Chrononhotonthologos* (1734) and *Of Stage Tyrants* (1735), while a third edition of *Chrononhotonthologos* which made its appearance on December 9, 1743, was published by Roberts.¹

These three facts alone would lead one very strongly to suspect that Carey was the author of the work, but other evidence, both internal and external, is available, which makes the supposition a certainty. The general style bears a very close resemblance to that of the prefaces to Carey's plays and collections of poetry, and there are even to be found in it phrases and expressions which are repeated in Carey's other works. In his dedication of the pamphlet to the fictitious Mr. Braund the author refers to his patron in the terms,

O Braund, My Patron ! My Pleasure ! My Pride !

Some few years later Carey addressed Lord Chesterfield in almost identical language :

*O Chesterfield, my Patron and My Pride !*²

The author of the *Dissertation* proceeds,

I regard money but as a ticket which admits me to your delicate entertainments, to me more agreeable than all the Monkey Tricks of rival Harlequins.

In 1735, writing of Pantomimes, Carey had counselled writers to

*Prefer pure Nature and the Simple Scene
To all the Monkey Tricks of Harlequin.*

These two parallels would seem to connect the *Dissertation on Dumpling* with the epistle *Of Stage Tyrants*, while the Epicurean views which are expressed throughout the work certainly accord with the jovial and bacchanalian sentiment of much of Carey's poetry. The point is finally decided by an advertisement which appears in the *Daily Advertiser* of December 9, 1743, announcing that "This day is Publish'd, Price Six Pence, the Sixth Edition of *A Learned Dissertation on Dumpling* by the late ingenious Harry Carey."³

Written in a highly facetious vein, the tract, as the title implies,

¹ See *The Daily Advertiser* of that date.

² The opening line of the epistle to Lord Chesterfield, *Of Stage Tyrants* (1735).

³ Carey had died by suicide a few weeks before, on October 4. The edition here advertised could not have been the sixth, for the seventh was published as early as 1727.

treats of the discovery of dumpling and pudding, and the history of those delicacies. Dumpling, the author affirms, is of great antiquity, having been introduced to these islands by Julius Cæsar; but the crude state in which it then was has since been improved by numerous generations of dumpling-makers, each of whom has added some new ingredient, or devised a new method of cooking. The account of the introduction of eggs is amusing, and very cleverly conceived.

The invention of eggs was merely accidental, two or three of which, having casually rolled off a shelf into a pudding which a good wife was making, she found herself under a necessity either of throwing away her pudding, or letting the eggs remain; but concluding from the innocent quality of the eggs that they would do no hurt if they did no good, she wisely jumbled 'em all together, after having carefully picked out the shells; the consequence is easily imagined; the Pudding became a Pudding of Puddings, and the use of eggs from thence took its date. The woman was sent for to court, to make puddings for King John, who then swayed the sceptre, and gained so much favour that she was the making of her whole family.

The office of pudding-maker, the author goes on to explain, became hereditary in her family, and each holder of it introduced some new variation, some new ingredient, or some fresh kind of pudding.

The work has more than an intrinsic interest, for it seems highly probable, or at least possible, that it suggested to Lamb, some hundred years later, the theme of his *Dissertation on Roast Pig*. The title of Lamb's essay might well have been copied from that of the earlier work, while a comparison of the passage from the *Dissertation on Roast Pig*, in which the author describes the discovery of crackling and roast pork by the mischievous young firebrand, Bo-Bo, with that quoted above from the *Dissertation on Dumpling* reveals an astonishing likeness between the two. Such a resemblance can hardly be regarded as a mere coincidence. Lamb, we know, was intimately acquainted with the more obscure literature of the early eighteenth century, and a pamphlet with a title so whimsical and so suggestive as this of Carey's would be sure to appeal to a taste such as his. Nowhere does he mention any work which would correspond to the *Dissertation on Dumpling*, yet we cannot but suspect that he did know it, and was influenced by it in the composition of his own *Dissertation*.

If, however, Carey's pamphlet gave rise to a much better known

work, it is possible that in its turn it had its own origin in a poem by Leonard Welstead, a contemporary of the author who had co-operated with him in the production of several musical works. In Welstead's *Ode on Apple Pie* (1704), there occurs the following passage relative to the history of the delicacy in question :

When first this infant dish in fashion came,
Th' ingredients were but coarse, and rude the frame ;
As yet unpolish'd in the modern arts
Our fathers eat brown bread instead of Tarts ;
Pies were but undigested lumps of dough,
Till time and just expence improv'd them so.
King Cole (as ancient British annals tell),
Renown'd for fiddling and for eating well,
Pippins in homely cakes with honey stew'd,
" Just as he bak'd," the proverb says, " he brew'd."
Their greater art succeeding Princes shew'd,
And modelled paste into a neater mode.
Invention now grew lively, palate nice,
And sugar pointed out the way to spice.
But here for ages unimprov'd we stood,
And apple pye was still but homely food ;
When godlike Edgar of the Saxon line
Polite of taste, and studious to refine,
In the desert perfuming Quinces cast,
And perfected with cream the rich repast.

It will be seen that the general scheme and conception of this poem is very like that of the passage quoted above from the *Dissertation on Dumpling*, and one is tempted to believe that it was Welstead's lines which gave to Carey the inspiration for his own *Dissertation*.

Although this pamphlet looks innocent enough, one cannot but suspect that there is more behind it than appears at first sight. It would seem to be a political satire. Carey, as we know, was no friend of party politicians, and never tired of satirising the conflict between Whig and Tory, and this, it is safe to aver, is the real subject of the *Dissertation on Dumpling*. In 1727 appeared a key, *Pudding and Dumpling Burnt to Pot*, By J. W., author of 684 Treatises, purporting to explain all the hidden references and satirical allusions. The more we study this Key the more mystified we become, and the more complicated and insolvable do the issues appear. The author of the *Dissertation* it alleges to have been Swift. While the Dean was dining with his publisher, the key narrates, pudding was served for dinner ; the conversation turned upon pudding and dumpling, and this it was which suggested the subject of the work, which was taken down by a hack writer at Swift's dictation. At the end of the treatise, however, it seems to occur to the writer that the Whiggism

of the *Dissertation* is hardly reconcilable with Swift's political views, and he therefore attempts to justify himself by assuring the reader that

The Dean is an arrant Whig by Education and Choice; he may, indeed, cajole the Tories with a belief that he is of their party, but it is all a joke; he is a Whig, and I know him to be so.

The authorship of this Key is obscure. "J. W., author of 684 Treatises" had probably no more than a fictitious existence, and his sole purpose was to conceal the identity of the real author. The work is to be regarded as a hoax, and in all probability a hoax by Carey, for he, it appears, was in whole or in part the writer of it.¹

"When a book has met with success," says the author, "it never wants a father, there being those good natur'd souls in the world who, rather than let mankind think such productions sprung of themselves, will own the vagabond brat, and thereby become fathers of other men's offsprings." In the preface to his *Poems on Several Occasions* some few years later he wrote in a similar strain.

"Some of these offsprings of my brain were assigned to other fathers, and some good natur'd people (I thank 'em for it) thought them, homely as they are, too good to be mine." The style of this Key seems obviously to be Carey's, the whimsical humour bears the true stamp of his genius, and the political interpretation which it places upon the *Dissertation* accords with his usual attitude to the political issues of the day. Ministers of State, the rise of court favourites and parties by Royal favour, the cabals for the overthrow of unpopular ministers, the indiscriminate bestowal of offices and pensions, all these are held up to ridicule. The emptiness of the promises of politicians is admirably satirised by a "promise pudding," which when placed on the table proved to be nothing but a bladder of wind, and even the figure of the Duke of Marlborough appears under the guise of Sir John Pudding, at one time all in all to his monarch, but latterly discarded in favour of his rival. "The Dumpling Eaters," the *Dissertation* tells us, "are a race sprung partly

¹ I would suggest that J. W. stands for John Walton, another pseudonym of Carey. On the back of the earlier edition of the *Dissertation* are printed proposals for the publication of *The Antiquities of Grub Street*, by John Walton and James Andrews. This work never appeared, and it is quite evident, from the wording of the proposals, that the whole thing was a hoax, probably by the author of the *Dissertation*. This seems to offer an explanation of the J. W. of the "Key."

from the old Epicureans and partly from the Peripatetic sect." Thus the Key explains the allusions :

By Dumpling is meant a place, or any other reward or encouragement. A Pudding signifies a P—t, and sometime a C—tee. A Dumpling Eater is a dependent on the court, or, in a word, any one who would rather pocket an affront than be angry at a Tip in Time. A cook is a minister of state. The Epicurean and Peripatetic sects are the two parties of Whig and Tory, who are both greedy enough of Dumpling.

The tract, then, has plainly a political significance. Like many another satire of those days, it can be read purely as a fantastic and amusing story, but beneath the surface there lies a deeper meaning. For its own sake it is interesting, but it is doubly so when placed beside Lamb's *Dissertation on Roast Pig*.

FREDERICK T. WOOD.

OTHER PROBATIONARY ODES

In the *Review of English Studies* for April 1927, I presented some evidence for regarding *Extracts from the Album at Streatham* "not so much an imitation as a continuation of the *Rolliad* group of satires."¹ Since that time I have come upon four imitations of that part of the *Rolliad* group entitled *Probationary Odes for the Laureateship*. The first is *A Probationary Ode for the Laureateship*, by George Keate, Esq., written in 1785. With *Notes Critical and Explanatory*, by the Editor, London : printed for G. Kearsley, 1787. Unlike the true *Probationary Odes*, this quarto poem of eleven stanzas is not a parody of the supposed author's work but a scurrilous attack upon it and upon him. Its temper is indicated by the large engraved frontispiece entitled "Sketches from Nature" (the title of one of Keate's works) which represents a human-faced dog with the name "Keate" on its collar holding a lyre in one paw and a palette in another. "Warton's Odes" and "Hayley's Poems" are under the paws. Of the author I know nothing. He probably wrote the squib in 1787, the year he published it, but naturally professed it was written in 1785 when the appointment of the new laureate was

¹ The *Cambridge History of English Literature* lists in its bibliography of Robert Merry (XI, chapter viii) "The Album of Streatham . . . and the ode on the restoration of his Majesty, written by Mr. Merry. 1789" without making clear (what is none too clear in the British Museum catalogue, whence the item is derived) that only the ode is Merry's work.

under consideration. In adding extensive satirical notes, he followed *The Rolliad* itself rather than the *Probationary Odes*, although the latter has a few ironical notes.

This attack on Keate is somewhat in the style of "Peter Pindar" who, since he had recently flung at the Royal Academy a series of rough, satirical odes, and since he is addressed in the first stanza, was undoubtedly responsible for a *Probationary Ode for the Laureatship of the Royal Academy, By a Tag-Rag of the Sacred Nine* (1786). The novelty of this piece of twenty-eight stanzas lies in combining the Peter-Pindaric with the pseudo-laureate ode.

On May 20, 1790, Thomas Warton, whose appointment to be laureate had called forth the *Probationary Odes*, died. As the *Odes* were still enjoying great popularity (*The Rolliad* reached a twenty-first edition nine years later) it is not surprising that the idea was again taken up. Who planned the *New Probationary Odes* and whether, like the original series, they first appeared in the *Morning Post*, I have not yet learned, but the last five of the nine poems were the work of "Matthew Bramble," i.e. Andrew Macdonald. The authors parodied were "Peter Pindar," "Della Crusca," Brook Watson, John Wilkes, William Mason, Hunry Dundas (whose ode is "translated" by John Pinkerton), James Beattie, and William Hayley. The songs of all nine muses were included in *The Miscellaneous Works of A. M'Donald*, 1791.

Somewhat later the plan was revived in America by the publication, in Philip Freneau's *Gazette*, of a series of poems which were issued separately as *The Probationary Odes of Jonathan Pindar, Esq., a Cousin of Peter's, and Candidate for the Post of Poet Laureate to the C.[ongress of the] U.[nited] S.[tates]* (Philadelphia, 1796).¹

It should be observed that the authors of the earlier and possibly of the later odes may perhaps have owed something to a piece which was widely known earlier in the eighteenth century through frequent stage presentations. This was Thomas Cooke's *Battle of the Poets, or the Contention for the Laurel* which was introduced into the second act of Fielding's *Tom Thumb* and which represented Cibber, Theobald, and Stephen Duck as contesting for the laureateship made vacant by the death of Eusden.²

RAYMOND D. HAVENS.

The John Hopkins University.

¹ See Joseph Sabin's *Dictionary of Books relating to America*, N.Y., 1885, xv. 130.

² See W. L. Cross, *The History of Henry Fielding*, 1918, i. 95-97.

NOTES ON *SIR GAWAIN AND THE GREEN KNIGHT*

THE following few notes, mostly interpretative rather than linguistic, were made in working through Messrs. Tolkien and Gordon's edition of *Sir Gawain* (Clarendon Press, 1925). They are offered as a mite towards the revised reissue which will no doubt soon be required. None of the points here touched on have been dealt with, so far as I know, by reviewers.

l. 806, *auinant*. Glossed "adj. pleasant"; but is it not better as adverb: "To lodge in that dwelling while the festival lasted—[to lodge] pleasantly [too]"? The adjective is ambiguous (with "hostel" or with "halyday"?), and an adverbial phrase is common in these short "bob" lines. O.E.D. does not record the word as adverb, but "avenantly" occurs in *William of Palerne*, and in *Gawain* adjectival for adverbial forms are frequent.

l. 839, *per*. Glossary "whereas." I cannot understand this. Perhaps it is a slip for "wherefore," which Skeat gave as a rendering in similar passages in Chaucer (e.g. *Cant. Tales*, D1561, E1308). But in this common M.E. idiom "*per*" can hardly be separately rendered; it is a mere interjection introducing an asseveration: "May Christ reward you for it!" It occurs again in *Patience*, 188 (in *oratio obliqua*): "*per* Raguel in his rakentes hym rere of his dremes." I think lines like *Gawain* 2120: "Cayrez bi sum oþer kyth, *per* Kryst mot yow spede" show how the idiom developed; here "*per*" may mean "where," but it is so weakened as to be little more than a copulative or an interjection. Cf. the weakened sense of "*weþer*" in l. 2186, where it merely introduces a direct question, and the original notion "which of two" has almost vanished.

l. 918, *Wich spede is in speche*. I should render: "What is (i.e. what-sort-of-thing makes) success in conversation we may learn without asking," with "*Wich*" as pronoun; not, as the glossary implies: "What profit there is in conversation." The knights do not need to learn whether "*luf-talkyng*" is worth while, but how to achieve success in it.

ll. 943-4, *fayrest . . . of alle oþer*. The editors' note, "This illogical construction is not uncommon in Middle English," is misleading; it has remained "not uncommon" down to the present day, and is, says Mr. Fowler (*Dictionary of Modern English Usage*,

1926, p. 410), "perhaps to be counted among the STURDY INDEFENSIBLES that are likely to survive their critics." A somewhat surprising example is in the first sentence of Milton's preface to *Samson Agonistes*: "Tragedy . . . hath ever been held the gravest, moralest, and most profitable of all other poems."

l. 955. The glossary notes correctly that "displayed" is a past participle; but should not this line be placed between dashes or, better, in brackets, to show that the subject of "Schon" (956) is "Kerchofes" (954), l. 955 being an "absolute" construction inserted as a parenthesis?

l. 987. For clearness a comma is needed after "wede," and that at the end of l. 986 might perhaps be omitted.

l. 999. *Boþe at mes and at mele*. The renderings given in the glossary (there is no note) hardly make sense: "Both at meal and at meal-time." If the editors reject the old interpretation of "mes" as "[morning] Mass-time" and "mele" as "dinner-time," they should give their reasons. Surely it is natural to suppose that two distinct meal-times are referred to?

l. 1112. *Who bryngez vs þis beuerage, þis bargayn is maked*. With "Who" as interrogative pronoun, as glossed here, the rendering will be: "Who is bringing us the drink?—this bargain is made," i.e. the lord calls out to the attendants to bring the drink with which to seal the bargain (cf. ll. 1408-9). But it should be observed that "Who . . . beuerage" is an exclamation rather than a question; we may compare the common Elizabethan use of "When?" to arouse attention (e.g. *Julius Caesar*, II, i, 5). I should, however, prefer a different and simpler interpretation, with "Who" as merely an alternative spelling of the interjection "Hoo" (cf. l. 2330), and "bryngez" as imperative: "Ho! bring us the drink." O.E.D. gives fifteenth-century examples of the spellings "who" and "whoo" as a variant of "ho."

l. 2126. *gruchyng*. Glossary: "reluctant(ly)"; but "murmuring" or "displeased" is a better rendering. Gawain is not "reluctant" to thank the man or to wish him well; he is mortified at the idea that he could ever be a coward, and "gruchyng" describes his tone of voice. It is exactly the word for the "grumbly" tone which is as far as "goud Gawayn" would go in the direction of discourtesy! Certainly "gruche" often means "to grudge, bear ill-will" (as in l. 2251); but it may also be applied to the appropriate tone of voice, or even to the growling of wild beasts,

e.g. by Trevisa (*Medieval Lore*, ed. R. Steele (1905), p. 168): "When the hunter heareth the grutching of that beast that runneth after him."

l. 2301. *I hope þat þi hert arȝe wyth þyn awen seluen.* The glossary gives: "I hope that thy heart quails at thine own self." But in this author "hope" generally means "reckon, expect," rather than "hope" in its modern sense; the latter notion *may* be included (cf. l. 2308), but more often it is not (l. 140, etc.). Besides, why should Gawain either hope or believe that the Green Knight is "afraid of himself"? I should interpret "wyth" as "with reference to, concerning," and translate: "I reckon that thy heart is afraid for thine own self," i.e. "you are afraid for your own skin, not I for mine."

l. 2318. *under.* May this not mean "under his left arm," rather than simply "down"? Supposing the shield to be slung on his right shoulder, a single jerk would bring it round his left side, under his arm, ready to be seized in his left hand.

l. 2339-40. The glossary rendering would be: "No man has in unmannerly fashion ill-used thee, nor treated thee discourteously save in accordance with the compact," i.e. "vnmanerly" is referred both to "mysboden" and to "kyd." This is clumsy, and seems insufficiently supported by "cortaysly had hym kydde" at l. 775. Moreover it is open to the logical objection which Ben Jonson laid against Shakespeare's making his Cæsar say "Cæsar did never wrong but with just cause." The Green Knight's point is that he has not been unmannerly *at all*; and the terms of the compact, which he claims to have strictly observed, did not permit any discourtesy on either side. I should omit the comma after "kyd" and render this line: "Nor [has any man] behaved but in accordance with the compact," etc., literally "displayed [anything] but in accordance."

l. 2345-7. The translation in the note is very awkward, requiring not only that "And roue . . . sore" be taken as parenthetical, but also that a relative "which" be understood as object of "profered." But may not this verb be regarded as intransitive, i.e. with indirect object only, "I offered [aimed a blow] at thee"? We could then render: "First I threatened thee merrily with a feint only, and rent thee not with a grievous wound; justly did I aim at thee, in accordance with the compact." O.E.D. gives several early examples of the intransitive sense "to make an offer," to which

this is fairly close. Cf. also Chaucer, *Cant. Tales*, A3289, "profred hir so faste," where it means "importuned," taking the sense partly from the context, as in the *Gawain* passage.

l. 2376. *kest*. Glossary "?fastening." Does it not apply to the whole girdle, which the poet calls "the tricky thing," in sympathetic anticipation of Gawain's own word "falssyng" in l. 2378? Cf. also l. 2413, where "kest" is the whole "trick" played him by the ladies, of which the girdle was the main instrument.

l. 2385. *style*. Glossary: "I confess to you, knight, here between ourselves," etc. At this period "style" certainly means "quietly" or "secretly" (rather than "persistently" or "ever"); but the paraphrase "between ourselves" appears to imply that Gawain wishes to keep his fault a secret—an absurd suggestion. The natural interpretation here is "quietly, without protest or outcry," and hence "submissively, humbly," as in *Patience* 371: "ye peple pitosly pleynd ful style" (cf. also *Patience* 402).

R. W. KING.

Bangor, N. Wales.

REVIEWS

The Southern Passion. Edited from Pepysian MS. 2344 in the library of Magdalene College, Cambridge, with introduction, notes and glossary, by BEATRICE DAW BROWN, Ph.D. Published for the Early English Text Society by Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press. 1927. Pp. cx+124. 15s. net.

THE very lengthy and detailed introduction to Mrs. Carleton Brown's edition of the text, a large part of which had already been published separately (*A Study of the Middle English Poem known as the Southern Passion*. Oxford: 1926), is of varying merit. The five sections into which it is divided deal with the relation of the text to the *South English Legendary*, the MSS., the place of origin and dialect of the poem, its sources, and the possibility of a friar or friars having been responsible for the authorship of the *Legendary*. There is little to criticise in the first of these sections. The relationship of the so-called *Southern Passion* to the longer work, the *South English Legendary*, in which it is embedded, affords some interesting problems, which are on the whole well worked out by the present editor. The relationship to other poems occurring in some of the numerous MSS. of the *Legendary* is, however, only indicated, and not worked out in detail, since, as Mrs. Carleton Brown points out, the texts of these poems are not yet accessible in printed editions. The parallels quoted on pp. ix-x in support of the theory of common authorship of parts at least of the *Legendary* and of the *Southern Passion* are not all very convincing.

In Section II there is a good and thorough discussion of the intricate problems of the extant MSS. and their relationship to one another. Mrs. Carleton Brown divides them into two groups, one containing MSS. Pepys 2344, King's College, Cambridge 13 and Bodleian 20,236, the other containing the seven remaining manuscripts. This division seems, according to the detailed evidence collected, to be substantiated by fairly definite and well-marked

resemblances and variations. Finally, the probable relationship of the two groups to one another is worked out.

The third section, dealing with the place of origin and the dialect of the poem, is the weakest portion of Mrs. Carleton Brown's work. In the table of dialectal variations given on pp. xxxvi-xxxvii, which she uses throughout this section as the basis of her examination of the dialect of the various manuscripts, a number of points are omitted, and others are given in a distinctly questionable form. The developments of O.E. *ā*, *æ* (1) and *æ* (2) in the various dialects of Middle-English are omitted altogether, and though the voicing of initial *s* in certain dialects is noted, the parallel development of initial *z* is not mentioned. The list of characteristic pronoun forms is incomplete. The grouping together of the developments of Old English *ū* and *ȳ* leads to hopeless confusion later on, and no distinction is made between the *u*- and *ü*- sounds of Middle-English; *o* or *e*, with no indication as to length or as to tense or slack quality, is given as the general development in Middle-English of "O.E. *a*, *ea*, before *ld*." There is a bad misprint, *l* for *i*, in section 11 of this table (p. xxxvii). Throughout this section, Middle-English *eni* is given among instances of the development of Old English *a* before a nasal, and is made the basis of a theory that *e* was a possible Middle-English development of this sound. The existence of Old English dialectal *gehēran* beside Late West Saxon *gehýran* does not appear to be recognised, and on p. xliii, Middle-English *ihere* and *ihure* are both given as examples of the development of Old English *ȳ*. There are many other instances of inaccuracy and inconsistency.

Mrs. Carleton Brown is on safer ground in the two final sections. The question of the author's debt to the *Historia Scholastica* of Peter Comestor is well and carefully worked out, and, except for one rather far-fetched parallel (p. lxiv, vv. 341-342), is convincing. The parallels with the work of Hugo de St. Victor are not nearly so close, and some of them may well, as Mrs. Carleton Brown herself admits, be traced to other sources; while the one parallel with the work of Abbé Robert of Tuy is hardly striking enough to afford much basis for theory. The most interesting point raised in this section is the relationship between the *Southern Passion* and the *Meditationes Vitæ Christi*. There seems to be a distinct probability that the author of the *Southern Passion* is drawing upon the *Meditationes*, as the parallels quoted are numerous, and these comprise not verbal resemblances only, but similarities in choice of theme, treatment

and general outlook. But if the author of the *Southern Passion* did in effect draw upon the *Meditationes Vitæ Christi*, then, as Mrs. Carleton Brown points out, this entails a modification of the generally accepted view that the *Meditationes* is a work of the fourteenth century; it cannot, if this theory be adopted, be later than the thirteenth century, and the possibility of St. Bonaventura's authorship, discredited by Peltier and other scholars, could no longer be rejected on ground of date alone.

The concluding section deals with the possible authorship of the *South English Legendary*, and, incidentally, of the *Southern Passion*. Mrs. Carleton Brown is probably right when she advances the theory that the authorship can probably be credited to the friars; and the contrast between the characterisation of St. Dominic and that of St. Francis certainly lends colour to the theory that it is to the Dominicans rather than to the Franciscans that the work may be attributed.

HELEN T. McMILLAN BUCKHURST.

Der Lautbestand des südmittelenglischen Octavian, verglichen mit seinen Entsprechungen im Lybeaus Desconus und im Launfal. By Dr. ERNA FISCHER. Anglistische Forschungen 63. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1927 Pp. viii+216. M.4.80.

DR. ERNA FISCHER presents us in this monograph with a full and careful study of the phonology (consonants and stressed vowels) of *Octavian* (MS. Cot. Calig. A II) in comparison with that of *Lybeaus Desconus* and *Launfal*. Her chief object is to test Sarrazin's assignment of the three poems to one author, and although a positive result was not to be expected, she has at least shown that there is nothing in the phonological characters of the three romances, or in their apparent dates, to make unity of authorship impossible. Dr. Fischer comes to the conclusion that the poems in question were written probably in Northern Essex, during the second half of the fifteenth century, *Launfal* being the earliest, and *Octavian* the latest, of the three.

The introduction includes an account of editions of the texts and a short but interesting section on some problems of rhyme.

The orthography of the MS. of *Octavian*, with special reference to the possibility of Anglo-Norman influence, is treated at considerable length, the result being to show that there is no A.-N. influence other than that which had become fully established by this date.

The main part of the investigation is based almost entirely on rhymes: the only possible method, since *Lybeaus Descomus* is found in six manuscripts, though *Octavian* and *Launfal* have survived in one MS. only. The chief distinction between the poems seems to be a variation in the proportion of *e*-rhymes to *i*-rhymes for OE *ȳ*, *Launfal* having the largest proportion of *e*-rhymes, and *Lib. Desc.* the smallest. This is probably partly a matter of chance; each of the texts has *e* more often than any other type, in rhyme. There are rather more fracture-forms (of *æ* before *l*+cons.) in *Lib. Desc.* than in the other romances. The same text has several striking examples of rhymes of OE. *ā* with OE. *ǣ* lengthened in an open syllable. Dr. Fischer, while calling attention to these rhymes, offers no explanation of them.

A few points of detail seem to call for comment. It is hardly necessary to assume either Northern or Kentish influence for the undiphthongised forms *dozter*, *nozt*, etc., since such forms occur in other E. Midl. texts, for example, in the fifteenth-century MS. of Bokenam's *Lives of Saints*, which has *noht*, *brought*, etc., by the side of *brought*, *nouht*, *doughter*, etc. The spellings with *ȝ*, *h*, are in any case probably traditional in both the diphthongised and undiphthongised forms; both *Octavian* (see p. 15) and Bokenam have not infrequent examples of inverted spellings such as *couȝde* "could" (Oct.), *owȝte* (Bok.). The form *wessche* (inf., p. 50) is probably due to an EME. raising of *æ* to *e* before *sch*. The form *late* (PP., Oct., p. 100; 2 Pl. Imperat., *Lib. Desc.*, p. 102) may represent ON. *lāta*; cf. the frequent spelling *late* (inf., etc.) in Bokenam.

The weakest point of the discussion lies in the assumption that rhymes of OE. *ǣ*¹ or *ǣ*² with OE. *ēa* necessarily indicate a slack vowel for the former (p. 92, ff.). Miss B. A. Mackenzie has shown (E. St. 61, 1927) that OE. *ēa* became a tense vowel (rhyming with OE. *ē*, *ēo*, *i*-mutation of *ēa*, Fr. *ē*) in some Eastern dialects of Middle-English, notably in those of Suffolk, Essex, and perhaps Herts (see Mackenzie, *Early London Dialect*, § 350). Dr. Fischer quotes no rhymes of OE. *ēa* with OE. lengthened *ē* (a definitely slack vowel in ME.) in *Octavian*, but several with OE. *ē*, *ēo*, and Fr. *ē*; we may

take it that OE. *ēa* had become a tense vowel in the dialect of this text. No rhymes are given for OE. *ēa* in *Lib. Desc.* and *Launfal*, but Dr. Fischer states that both texts have slack [*ē*] for *ēa* except before a back consonant. If this is so, it is an important point against the identification of their dialect with that of Octavian.

It is interesting to note with reference to Dr. Fischer's assignment of *Octavian* to North Essex (p. 192), and the absence or extreme rarity of the normal Essex *ā* for *æ*¹ and *æ*² in this text (pp. 93, 99, 100), that Miss Mackenzie's results show that most of the EME. Essex forms with *e* instead of *a* for *æ*¹ and *æ*² occur in names of places in the extreme north of the county, on the Suffolk border (*Early London Dialect*, § 89).

There are few indications in the rhymes of the text of any late ME. or Early Modern developments. Sarrazin believed that the poet showed traces of the diphthongisation of *ī* (e.g. in the rhyme *conceyue : alyue*); but Dr. Fischer shows that this cannot be definitely proved. The spelling is remarkably free from "modern" forms.

Use of and reference to the monograph would have been made much easier if the numbering of the sections had begun at the beginning instead of at p. 48, and had included the introduction, orthography, etc.; and still more so, if the section-numbers had been printed in the headlines, as one must frequently search through several pages to find the appropriate number. Finally, the points of agreement and divergence between the dialects of the three texts would have been very much clearer to the reader if a comparative table of the phonology had been provided in addition to the excellent summary of results on pp. 184-200.

MARY S. SERJEANTSON.

Le Merure de Seinte Eglise, by Saint Edmund of Pontigny, and Richard Rolle's Devout Meditacioun. Edited by HARRY WOLCOTT ROBBINS, Ph.D. Lewisburg, Pennsylvania: H. W. Robbins. [1927?] Pp. xlv + 78 + 27. \$2.

THIS is not a new book; Dr. Robbins has bound together an edition of *Le Merure de Seinte Eglise* (presented as a Ph.D. thesis to the University of Minnesota in 1923), and a reprint of his article, *An English Version of St. Edmund's Speculum ascribed to Richard Rolle*,

which appeared in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* in June 1925.

In his introduction, after a list of manuscripts of the Latin, French and English versions of *Le Merure*, he gives good reasons for considering the French version as the original rather than the Latin. (No claim has ever been made for the originality of the English versions.) The French version in Digby 20 (Bodley 1621) is the oldest extant manuscript of the work, and, as compared with it, the English and the Latin show signs of editing, both additions and rearrangements of the material being found. The strongest indication that the French is the original is the presence in it of rhyming and rhythmical passages which do not appear in the Latin. They point to a care for style on the part of the originator of this version which is not found in the others.

Two other problems discussed are the extent to which *Le Merure* influenced fourteenth-century English mystics, and the truth of the ascription to Rolle of certain translations of the book.

Dr. Robbins has not in either case examined the evidence in sufficient detail to be able to give certain conclusions. The characteristic use of rhythmical prose with occasional metre and rhyme may have influenced Rolle's style. Miss Allen, in her book on Rolle, admits the possibility of this and thinks that this influence is stronger than that of the substance of *Le Merure*. Dr. Robbins is content to limit the influence of the subject-matter to certain of Rolle's supposed lyrics, but he merely states that it is "undoubted" here, and does not illustrate it. He also finds some signs of St. Edmund's influence on Walter Hilton. His view is that on the whole the work acted more as inspiration to the fourteenth-century mystics than as direct source.

The problem of Rolle's responsibility for any of the English translations is discussed twice—once in the introduction to *Le Merure* itself, in connection with the translation in the Thornton MS., and again in the article bound up with *Le Merure*, in connection with the Cambridge MS. II. 6, 40. Since no conclusion is reached, it is perhaps safest to accept Miss Allen's view that in neither version is there anything that suggests Rolle. In the circumstances, it is a pity that Dr. Robbins used the words "Richard Rolle's *Devout Meditacioun*" as part of his title for this book.

The text of *Le Merure* given here is based on MS. Digby 20, and important variations from other manuscripts are cited. The

editing is careful and thorough. At the end of his book, Dr. Robbins gives an interesting list of the Anglo-Norman words and their equivalents in the Latin and English versions of the work.

DOROTHY EVERETT.

Havelok mit Einleitung, Glossar und Anmerkungen. Edited by F. HOLTHAUSEN. Third Edition. Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1928. Pp. xvi + 140. 2.80 Mk.

PROFESSOR HOLTHAUSEN'S well-known *Havelok* now appears in its third edition. The text has evidently been re-collated, the bibliography has been brought up to date, the glossary revised, and additional notes appear in an appendix. The Cambridge Fragments discovered by Professor Skeat are also given; and in the difficult passage, ll. 545-54, Professor Holthausen's introduction of a line from this source, "He þriste in his mouth wel faste," solves the grammatical difficulty. This necessitates the assumption that a later line was scribally added in the Laud MS. or one of its ancestors to preserve the couplets. Professor Holthausen suggests l. 549; but it should be noted that in l. 552, "þat he shulde him forth [lede]," the last word is lacking. If this had been "te" (OE. *tēon*), it might easily have attached itself to the end of "forth," and then been lost. The sense would be better, as *Havelok* was fast bound, and might have been dragged, but could not have been led. The superfluous line would then be l. 554, "þat forwarde makeden he."

A good emendation is made in ll. 1824-5,

þanne þe sixe weren doun[e] feld
þe seueneþe brayd ut his swerd,

by changing "feld" to "laid," and altering the order to "his swerd ut brayd." In the parallel passage, ll. 2658-9,

þanne he woren fallen bopen
Grundlike here swerdes ut drowen,

Professor Holthausen emends to "[H]e drowen here swerdes wroþe," giving up "grundlike," a favourite word in the poem. But seeing that the sense of both passages is the same, it seems likely that the

scribe has twice sacrificed the rhyme to avoid the word "laid" = thrown, and that the couplet was originally

þanne he worn boþe laid
Grundlike here swerdes he ut brayd.

In ll. 1056-7

þe chaumpiouns, þat þat put sowen,
Shuldreden ilc oþer and lowen,

Professor Holthausen gives up his earlier emendation of "lowen" to "[f]lowen." But, as Dr. Sisam says, the rhyme is bad. "[F]lowen" seems to make excellent sense. The champions, being hopelessly beaten, departed in a crowd, cf. l. 1058.

The phrase "wel (*or* iuele, etc.) o bon," ll. 2355, 2505, etc., the editor connects with OE. *bān*, rejecting Madden and Sisam's derivation from OE. Scand. *bōenn*. But it is noteworthy that in all four cases it rhymes with OE. *ō*.

Several small emendations are introduced to give smoother scansion. Here might be noticed ll. 249, 2636, 2897, "ne forgat nouht," emended to "forgat he nouht." But this verb may stress on the prefix, e.g. "Yet forgat I to maken rehersaille," *Cant. Tales*, G. 852, "We shal therwith so foryete or oppresse," *Troilus*, v, 398. Again in l. 810, "To morwen shal ich forth [to] pelle," Professor Holthausen justifies the addition by a reference to l. 918, and an article by Kaluza in *Englische Studien*, 14. But l. 918 is an example of the common mediæval construction of the second of two parallel infinitives taking "to," and Kaluza's examples are confined to those in which the infinitive precedes the auxiliary.

In the Glossary we may note "pliht," which here means rather "guilt" than "trouble, anxiety." The word "lith" in "lond and lith," l. 2515, translated here and in *N.E.D.* "people," presents an interesting problem. The only example in *N.E.D.* which gives any clue to its meaning is its use by Robert of Brunne to render "tere et tenement." But in the *Lay Folks Catechism* the ninth commandment, "thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house," is said to cover "all wrangwise couatise of land or of lithe or of ought elles that mai noght be lifted ne raised fro the ground;" while the tenth covers all movables, "as robes or richesse." Whatever the derivation, this suggests that in this phrase the word had come to mean "fixtures."

In l. 1157, "And seyde til hire [fals] and slike," Professor

Holthausen glosses "slike" as "smooth," comparing OE. *slician*. But Godric is threatening her with banishment, hanging or burning; scarcely a smooth way of talking. I would suggest replacing Skeat's "fals" by "schame," and deriving "slike" from ON. *slikr*; cf. *Allit. Alex.*, l. 1189, "þe somme of siluer & of siche." The rhyme presents difficulty, but cf. *siþe*, *wiþe*, ll. 1051-2; *syre*, *hire*, ll. 1229-30.

A few misprints may be noted: in l. 64 the comma after "bold" should be deleted; in l. 600 read "shal [ai] god" (?); l. 629, "fre[man]"; l. 747, "it callen"; l. 802, "strong"; l. 1336, "with." In the note to l. 44, "wente" should read "ȝede;" and the note on l. 1936 has been transferred to l. 1966.

MABEL DAY.

The Seege or Batayle of Troye. A Middle-English Metrical Romance edited from MSS. Lincoln's Inn 150, Egerton 2862, Arundel XXII, with Harley 525 included in the Appendix. By MARY ELIZABETH BARNICLE, New York University. London: Published for the Early English Text Society by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1927. Pp. lxxiv + 274. 25s.

THE greater part of Miss Barnicle's introduction is devoted to a discussion of the sources of the poem and its four extant MSS., Harleian (H), Lincoln's Inn (L), Egerton (E) and Arundel (A). While not minimising the very great divergence of the text of H from that of L, E and A, she does not accept Fick's theory that the scribe of H is following a version belonging to a different line of descent from the group L, E, A. An examination of H's peculiarities leads her to the conclusion that the scribe-editor of this version was a man of considerable scholarly attainment and independence of mind, who deliberately adapted the text from which he was working, transforming it from a "minstrel" to a "reading" romance. It is an interesting theory, and the evidence, though not conclusive, is on the whole in its favour. Incidentally, one must protest against the silliness, if not the absolute lack of taste, of the comparison made quite irrelevantly on p. liii.

While H undoubtedly has an interest of its own, it is certainly

farthest from the original, and Miss Barnicle is quite right in relegating it to an appendix, and taking L, for whose superiority there is much to be said, as her standard text. With regard to this text, however, she is content with rather slender evidence as to its place of origin and as to the "Jamys" whose name is scribbled on f. 103b., whom she takes to be the scribe. She is here basing theory on theory, and is too dogmatic in her conclusions. An extreme instance is to be found on p. xiii. Here she says:

On the hypothesis that Jamys was a scribe connected with Wenlock Priory, line 304, in which he tells the reader that the masons who came at Priam's bidding to re-wall Troy "well coupe worche wiþ lym and ston" (not found in any of the other versions of the *Seege of Troye*) is almost a confirmation of the scribe's having lived in the vicinity of the well-known range of limestone hills called Wenlock Edge."

The connection of the MS. with Wenlock at all is open to doubt; there is no positive evidence that "Jamys" was the scribe, and the phrase "lym and ston" ("mortar and stone") is a common M.E. tag, found in works as widely scattered as *Ormulum* (l. 16285, "lim & stan"), *Lazamon's Brut* (l. 15818, "lim & stan"), *Cursor Mundi* (l. 25468, "lime and stane"), and Wiclif's *Sermons* (*Selected Works*, ii, 209, "liym and stoon").

The chief point of interest in Miss Barnicle's discussion of the probable sources of the poem is her opposition to the theory, first advanced in 1888 by E. T. Granz and supported later by C. H. A. Wager and G. L. Hamilton, of an expanded version of the *Roman de Troie*, no longer extant, from which the author of the *Seege*, Konrad von Würzburg, and possibly a number of other authors of various nationalities drew much of their material. This was an attempt to explain a number of episodes in these versions of the Troy tale which could not be traced to any extant original. But Miss Barnicle contends that, far from solving the problem, this hypothesis merely increases the difficulties; for the variation in these untraced episodes is so great in the various versions which embody them, that derivation from a single original seems hardly a tenable theory.

In dealing with the dialect of the poem, Miss Barnicle has wisely separated the question of the dialect of the extant MSS. and of that of the original composition. There is little to criticise here, though doubtless some will cavil at her reference to the "narrowness, tenuity and 'whine' of the East Anglian dialect." It is hardly accurate to refer (p. xxvi) to *childre* and *chyldre* as "irregular"

plurals; and on p. xxix a distinction between the *ǣ* and *ā* of O.E. would have made for greater clarity; but these are minor points. More serious is the omission of any examination of the vocabulary of the poem (with the exception of a reference to two Welsh words) with a view to its bearing upon the original dialect. In dealing with the date of composition, an analysis of the language might with advantage have been included, if only to corroborate the points brought forward.

Two points in the notes call for criticism. On p. xiv, Note 1, it is stated of *Piers Plowman* that "the poem is the work of a Shropshire poet born at Cleobury Mortimer." Mr. Allan H. Bright, in his *New Light on Piers Plowman* (Oxford University Press, 1928) has made out a good case for Ledbury, rather than Cleobury, as the poet's birthplace. The second point is of a very different kind. Two fairly lengthy quotations from the Icelandic *Trojumanna Saga* are given in the notes on pp. lxv and lxvii; all through these, the letter *ð* has been omitted. Judging from the spacing, the blame attaches not so much to the printer as to the author, who appears to have left blank spaces for the letter in her typescript, and to have looked through her proofs so casually as not to notice the sheer nonsense that results; but the result is bewildering to the reader, and a careless mistake of this kind is hardly what one would expect in an *E.E.T.S.* publication. There are other mistakes, such as as for *sá*, in these passages, which make one doubt whether Miss Barnicle's acquaintance with the Icelandic text is first-hand.

HELEN T. McMILLAN BUCKHURST.

Die Funktionen des Erzählers in Chaucers Epischer Dichtung. By H. LÜDEKE, Dr. Phil. (Studien zur Englischen Philologie, hgg. von Morsbach und Hecht, LXXII.) Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer. 1927. Pp. x+158. 7 Mk.

MORE vividly than any other writer does Chaucer appear in person before us when telling the stories he has read or the dreams he has dreamed. He gives us reminiscences of his domestic life, talks of his hopeless love affair, and alternatively assures us that he "can not of that faculte." In numerous short phrases he tells us that he is abbreviating his matter, that his theme is beyond his capacity, or

he appeals to his audience for attention or sympathy. Dr. Lüdeke has classified all the personal interpolations and addresses to his audience which are made by the narrator in Chaucer's poetry (including, without comment, the first part of the *Romance of the Rose*), with a view to showing the objects they serve. He finds that they frequently, though by no means invariably, mark the dropping of one thread of the story to take up another, the introduction or termination of a parenthesis, a departure from the source or an elision of the material in it. He compares his use of the personal formula with that of his predecessors and contemporaries, and finds that in Machaut the character of the narrator is most developed. Dante also, from whom or from Boccaccio Chaucer must have learned his use of the invocation, afforded a precedent.

By the use of these interpolations the figure of the narrator is gradually caused to stand out between the reader and the story, or, as Dr. Lüdeke puts it, becomes the intermediary between the poet and the hearer. For in his opening paragraph he draws a distinction between poet and narrator which is not always easy to follow. When the *Roman de la Rose* and *Piers Plowman* end with the words "I awoke," he says that the pronoun refers to the hero of the story and not the narrator in our sense. Again, while he takes the Prologue to the *Confessio Amantis* as Gower's personal introduction, he says that in Book I it is the narrator, and not Gower, who tells of his love troubles. Chaucer may give to his narrator his own characteristics, even his own name, and, in the *Legend*, his works; but apparently they must not be identified. This perhaps makes it easier for Dr. Lüdeke to represent Chaucer, in the face of the well-known description in the *House of Fame*, as a man of the world, such as was Shakespeare, and a skilled elocutionist. When the Squire utters his discriminating praise of the delivery of the knight on the brazen horse:

Accordant to his wordes was his cheere,
As techeth art of speche hem that it leere,

we may imagine Chaucer fearing lest in time to come some town crier may speak his lines.

Dr. Lüdeke devotes a special chapter to the *Canterbury Tales*, where there is, so to speak, a double narration, and combats the views expressed in Kittredge's *Chaucer and his Poetry* that the tales are "merely long speeches expressing, directly or indirectly, the

characters of the several persons." He points out incongruities such as the Knight's

For women, as to speken in comune,
Thei folwen all the favour of Fortune,

where the accents are those of the poet himself rather than of the Knight. With the sure instinct of a great artist Chaucer developed the characters of his narrators in their proper place, the framework, and thus kept apart the dramatic and epic elements.

MABEL DAY.

Sir Thomas Malory: His Turbulent Career. A Biography by EDWARD HICKS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1928. Pp. xiv + 118. 11s. 6d. net.

SOME thirty years ago Professor Kittredge succeeded in identifying the author of the *Morte d'Arthur* with Sir Thomas Malory of Newbold Revell in Monk's Kirby, Warwickshire, who served under Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick, in the Hundred Years' War, and sat as member for Warwickshire in the Parliament of 1445. It was afterwards pointed out that in 1451 Sir Thomas was charged with breach of peace towards the Carthusian house of Axholme in Lincolnshire, to which the revenues of a suppressed alien priory at Monk's Kirby had been transferred. Mr. Hicks now makes a great addition to our knowledge by the discovery in the Record Office of many legal proceedings following upon that charge, and in particular of a long inquisition by Warwickshire and Leicestershire juries presided over by Humphrey, Duke of Buckingham, at Nuneaton, on August 23, 1451. It is rather a distressing story. According to the indictments of the juries, this "parfit gentil knyght" was committed on the original charge, which was not before them, to the sheriff of Warwickshire, at Coleshill, on a Sunday. On the Tuesday he broke prison by swimming the moat, and on the Wednesday and Thursday made two raids with a number of followers upon Combe Abbey and carried away large sums of money and other property. The indictments also detail a number of other offences against person and property committed by Sir Thomas during the year or so preceding his arrest. He had laid in wait for the Duke of Bucking-

ham in the woods of Combe with intent to murder him. He had twice broken into houses of one Hugh Smith and raped his wife. He had taken money and cattle by violence from other private persons. Mr. Hicks adds an isolated record of a similar offence as far back as 1443. And as in duty bound, he warns us that we must not take the charges at their face value. Such acts were the normal fifteenth-century method of pressing disputed legal claims. There was a strong Lollard feeling against the religious houses, which were slower than private landowners in manumitting their serfs after the Black Death. The Duke of Buckingham was himself presiding at the trial of a man accused of attempting his life. Contemporary suits are full of the most extravagant charges. This is all true enough, but one is left with the uneasy feeling that life had to teach Sir Thomas Malory a good deal before he was ready for some of those exquisite idealisms of the *Morte d'Arthur*. "What," said Sir Lancelot, "is he a thief and a knight, and a ravisher of women? He doth shame unto the order of knighthood and contrary to his oath, it is pity that he liveth." Certainly we have not Malory's answer to the indictments, for they never came to trial. The story is a little difficult to follow, since, while great credit is due to Mr. Hicks for his unearthing of the documents, it is quite clear that he or his transcriber has been singularly unsuccessful in reproducing them. He speaks of the "debased" Latin of the De Banco rolls, but it is really not so debased as that of his texts, and in particular it is obvious that many of the contractions must have been wrongly extended. Only one short passage is given in facsimile, but that is sufficient to confirm the impression that a revised transcript is highly desirable. It is a pity that a good bit of research should be so inadequately presented. However, it seems that Malory was brought before the King's Bench in January 1452, and put himself upon his country. A day was fixed for trial, but there were constant adjournments, during one or more of which Malory was free on bail. There was, in fact, no hearing until January 1456, when Malory produced a royal pardon for all offences committed before the preceding July 9. This was, of course, an end both to the original charge and to the indictments. As I read the facts, rather differently from Mr. Hicks, Malory was released on giving security against further breach of peace; did not, however, keep it, and was again arrested before the year was out for some new wrong to Combe Abbey. He spent some time in various prisons, Newgate, Ludgate, the

Marshalsea, with at least one interval of bail and one of unlicensed absence from the Marshalsea, and was finally committed to Newgate early in 1460. Here the new documents stop. It looks as if there must have been some trial and conviction of which the record has not been found. It is not clear whether Malory ever emerged from prison again. He was excluded from the two general pardons of Edward IV in 1468, almost certainly wrote the end of the *Morte d'Arthur* in prison, and was buried on March 14, 1471, in the London Grey Friars, hard by Newgate.

In conclusion, I may refer to a small heraldic point. Mr. Hicks tells us that in 1433-1434 Malory's father John used on a seal a coat of arms probably derived from the Revells, whose heiress had brought Newbold Revell into the family. This he describes as *Ermine, a chevron between three trefoils slipped argent, a bordure engrailed sable*. Some years ago Mr. T. W. Williams kindly sent me a copy of a deed sealed by the same John Malory on September 2, 1422, which is without the trefoils. And this is clearly the variety of the coat shown on the costume of John and his wife, Phillippa, in Mr. Hicks' frontispiece, taken from Dugdale's engraving of glass once in Grendon Church.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

The Eclogues of Alexander Barclay from the original edition by John Cawood. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by BEATRICE WHITE, M.A. Early English Text Society. Vol. 175. Humphrey Milford. 1928. Pp. lxxv + 272. 25s. net.

THE Early English Text Society has deserved well of all students of the fifteenth century of late, for within a few years, among other things, they have given us several volumes of Pecoock of the greatest importance in any philological, religious or historical survey of that century; they have issued a good text of Hawes' *Pastime of Pleasure*—a work of considerable interest, both to the literary historian and to the student of mediæval thought; they have continued to edit more of Caxton's works, and have issued the last of four volumes of Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*. More recently they have issued Barclay's *Eclogues*, edited by Miss Beatrice White, while the list of texts slowly preparing shows other important works yet to come. For all this

we cannot be too grateful, since it is clear that it is mainly to the work of the *E.E.T.S.* and like societies that we must look for the publication of unedited texts, and for the re-editing of texts that fall short of modern requirements.

Since this is so, it is greatly to be desired that the Council of the Society should consider the possibility of establishing some general principles for the guidance of their editors. Naturally it would not be easy to codify these in such a way that they would not be unduly irksome to the scholars who are such willing workers for the Society, yet I believe some such attempt should be made, and that it would be welcomed by many editors. At present it would appear that every editor is a law to himself: some give long introductions, others give practically none; some indulge in elaborate notes, etc., while others print their text with the briefest of apparatus. However grateful we are for the text (and I hope I do not seem to be ungracious about this), our gratitude is clearly increased when we find the volume enhanced by adequate biographical and bibliographical material, by such notes and glossary as the nature of the text demands, and by a concise appreciation of its literary and linguistic characteristics. It would be invidious in this *Review* to illustrate this from recent publications of the Society, but any reader will easily verify the extraordinary variations that exist in editorial procedure, by glancing at the last ten or twelve issues.

Literary critics have not been very favourably impressed by Barclay's work as a poet. The present editor is forced to admit that "it would be easy to condemn [the *Eclogues*] as pedestrian and hopelessly prolix, and to deny them most of the qualifications expected of poetry," and her strongest praise is summed up in the words, "If they never transport, they frequently rouse, sometimes delight, and seldom fail to interest and amuse" (p. lx). The truth is, however, that Barclay is only historically important. Poetically he is almost worthless, despite telling lines, here and there, such as: "The court is the baiting-place of Hell" (i, 586), or "Unapt to learn, disdaining to be taught" (iv, 703). In general, Barclay is content with a very pedestrian treatment of his material. We read him largely in order to see how the difficult business of importing a new and foreign literary form has been achieved, and also because of the material he provides for the social historian. Miss White has greatly assisted students of the first of these matters, for she has printed the relevant texts of Mantuan and *Æneas Sylvius* at the foot of each

page, so that we can see at once what material gave birth to Barclay's flights. On the other hand, the social historian will delight in many of the pictures drawn by Barclay with a certain picturesque vigour: thus we have the account of winter evening occupations in the houses of the rich (p. 154) in contradistinction to the way the poor live at this season (p. 183); the scandalous behaviour of the villagers on Saints' days (p. 210); the drawbacks incident on communal sleeping arrangements (p. 109), etc. Most of these things, even when suggested by the Latin, are worked out with homely detail by Barclay so as to increase our understanding of the life of his time.

This new edition has two great merits: the introductory life of Barclay is considerably fuller than anything previously written about him, and clears up several doubtful points. Miss White is in error, however, in asserting that because he is called "Sir Alexander Barclay, preest," "he certainly obtained a degree." Because he was a priest he received the courtesy title of Sir, but this is no evidence that he was entitled to it by academic qualification. Its second merit has already been mentioned—the careful way in which the Latin originals are examined and printed side by side with Barclay's text. Miss White unfortunately stops at this point, and it is here that some such general guidance as is desiderated above would have helped her. She would then have given us an adequate bibliographical survey instead of the brief half-page (lvii) and a couple of footnotes that have to serve us now, and she would certainly have given a more adequate set of notes. For example, we are not greatly helped when we read of a certain Micene (p. 159, l. 521) on turning to the notes to find that all Miss White vouchsafes is, "Cawood 'Micene.' Spenser Society facsimile 'Miceus.'" Is this really an allusion to Richard Mesyn or Misyn, Bishop of Dro-more, who died about 1462, as Miss E. P. Hammond has suggested, or what is the editor's view? Again, the lines on p. 165 are printed—

If the [they] have smelled the artes triviall,
They count them Poets hye and heroicall (ll. 695-696)

and consequently the printer's error of *triniall* for *triuiall* is un-noted. Yet the whole point of the passage depends on this, for Barclay is here ridiculing academic versifiers, and the *artes triuiall* are the three arts of the *Trivium*—the essentials of all University training of the day. But these are minor blemishes: Miss White

has given us a careful reproduction of Cawood's text, which in general is faithfully followed, and for that all students of the fifteenth century will be grateful.

H. S. BENNETT.

The Early London Dialect. Contributions to the Dialect of London during the Middle-English Period. By BARBARA ALIDA MACKENZIE. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1928. Pp. 152. 7s. 6d. net.

MISS MACKENZIE has made a much-needed attempt to survey the main phonological features of the London dialect throughout the Middle-English period—from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries—and to account for the changes that have taken place between the earlier and the later London dialects. The material on which the investigation is based consists of an examination of twelve important phonological features as revealed in texts and place-name forms.

In the earlier period (the twelfth and thirteenth centuries), Miss Mackenzie distinguishes between the City, the Westminster, and the Middlesex dialects. The City dialect was quite different from the Middlesex dialect of the same date. It was easterly in character and was identical with the early Essex dialect, whilst the Middlesex dialect was more westerly in type. The Westminster dialect shared some of the peculiarities of the City and some of those of the Middlesex dialect. There is no evidence of any specifically Kentish influence in either the City or the Middlesex dialect.

By the end of the thirteenth century there is evidence that alternative forms were dying out, and by the end of the fourteenth century London English was a single dialect, a blend, on the whole, of the early City and Middlesex dialects. Certain new features, however, had appeared which must have come from some other dialect area. Neighbouring dialects are examined with a view to tracing the source of these new types.

Miss Mackenzie has collected a considerable body of material and has made a definite contribution to her subject, but time is needed for criticism to do its work on the mass of information provided before the results can be fully accepted. In attempting to discover

dialectal features from place-name forms, it is impossible to have too large a collection of forms. Every document must be thoroughly dredged and account must be taken of the various types of documents and their sources of origin. A change of scribe may lead to a variation of spelling. Miss Mackenzie is not altogether consistent in her treatment of sources. In the first part, place-name forms are taken to represent the local form, except in § 41, where the solitary *Erdeleye* (in Essex) is ascribed to a London document. But in Part II, the sources are classified into (i) official papers, (ii) literary works, (iii) private and semi-private papers. Owing to the scope of her work, Miss Mackenzie has not always been able to make a complete collection of forms from the sources she has used. Certain statements, therefore, need qualification. *Erdeleye* (§ 41) is cited as "the only *e*-form." But *Erlea* occurs in Colch. Cart., *Erlee* 1201 C.R. Rlls., *Berde-* in Barstable, 1240-4 FF (3), 1274 RH, *Fernham* 1198 FF, 1281 Ch, all from sources used by Miss Mackenzie, to which may be added from other sources *Erleiga* 1087 (1450) *Eng. Hist. Rev.* 40. 74, *Erdleg'* 1254 *Ass*, 1262 *For*; *Merkeshale* 1212 Red Bk. Excheq., and *Berde-* in 1212 Red Bk. Excheq., and 1225 Pat. Similarly, to § 110, add *Hedfeld*, Colch. Cart., 1155 Red Bk. Excheq., 1173 Pipe Rlls., *Hetfeld*, Colch. Cartn., *Hethfeld* 1263 Ipm, *Semanneston* 1202 FF.

Variations from the normal Essex type Miss Mackenzie attempts to explain by influence from neighbouring dialects, usually Suffolk or Middlesex, the influence of which seems to have been extremely extensive, for Braxted, Danbury, and Notley (§ 12), and Broomfield (§ 89) are in the centre of the county. *Holemede* (*ibid.*) is in Goldhanger on the estuary of the Blackwater, whilst *Gavelmede* and *Poplesmede* 1230 FF (not cited) were in Hatfield Peverel between Chelmsford and Witham.

In § 28, Ekwall is misinterpreted. His statement is that Layer (adjoining Langenhoe) is probably not a Scandinavian name. There are other examples of *e* for OE. *æ* in Essex which cannot be Scandinavian forms, e.g. *Esse*, *Essa*, *Messebiria*, Colch. Cart.; *Sporkehette*, *Longeheker*, *Langheker* (*temp.* John, *Hornchurch Priory Docs.*). Misprints seem to be commendably rare, no small achievement in printing such a mass of detailed material. The three or four noted do not affect the argument. They are instances of the addition or omission of a medial or final *-e*.

PERCY H. REANEY.

English Literary Autographs, 1550-1650. Part II, Poets.
Edited by W. W. GREG, with the collaboration of J. P. GILSON,
R. B. McKERROW, HILARY JENKINSON, AND A. W. POLLARD.
Oxford University Press.

DR. GREG, after the dramatists, comes to the poets, but not without casting a look behind, for dramatists are to be found in this part of the work also : Bale, who was no great dramatist and nothing of a poet, and Preston, who, it seems fairly clear, was not even a dramatist. Both of these present the problem, familiar in the sixteenth century, of a varying hand, and one is inclined to agree with Dr. Greg and Mr. Gilson that the Carmelite MS. of Bale, though it claims to be an autograph, is a mere copy. Another Carmelite MS. of Bale, the Anglorum Heliades in the British Museum (Harley MS. 3838) might have been mentioned in connection with this question. It is in two hands, one of which is certainly Bale's, the other a transcriber's with corrections by Bale. The other hand here, however, bears no resemblance to that of the manuscript under discussion, and the problem remains one of pure palæography.

It occurs to one that students of English literature would owe yet another debt to Dr. Greg, if he would give us as a supplement to this work a handlist of the existing manuscripts of writers of this period. Those at any rate in public and otherwise accessible collections might be listed. Private collections in some cases present difficulties. The autographs of Herrick, which we miss sadly from this series, are in the Beaumanor Collection, and the Calthorpe MSS., often cited here, are generally inaccessible to students.

Such a list would complete the magnificent gift which Dr. Greg has given to the lovers of the great Tudor and Stuart ages. For this part has all the qualities which distinguished the first of the series : the excellent choice of documents, the admirable reproduction, the succinct and sufficient commentary, so that, when the third part completes the collection, we shall have an unrivalled instrument for the palæographical and textual study of the writers of the period it covers.

The actual documents here facsimiled are perhaps in themselves more interesting than those in the first part. Among others of less note we have the fascinating series of Spenser autographs with their curious problem of scripts, the splendid Trinity MS. of

Milton's minor poems and the Museum MS. of Samuel Butler, one of the rare examples of any body of work by a considerable poet of the period in his autograph. And, when we leave the great age and come down to the Stuart time, the poets are to most of us more interesting than the dramatists. It is surprising indeed how few actual autographs of their poems have survived. No poems of Randolph, Carew or Cleveland, the most popular poets of their generation, have come down to us in the writing of their authors, though copies of them abound in the written anthologies of the time. William Browne of Tavistock is, I believe, only represented by inscriptions in books. The survival of the Trinity Milton is one of the luckier oversights of Time and Chance.

Still, looking over this collection, we feel that we have a very satisfactory representation of the scripts in which the writers of the time set down the results of their inspiration or their industry. At the beginning the Middle Ages are still with us. The humanistic hand out of Italy is just beginning its contest with the common secretary hand, a development out of the Gothic cursive. We see the gradual supersession of Secretary, till at the end of the period the hand of the Restoration and the Eighteenth Century is already in sight. The script here is a figure of the mind. The period begins with Bale, the bibliographer of the Middle Ages; there is still some flavour of mediæval things in the Elizabethans and the metaphysicals; then the Puritans come and do what they had to do to England, and with the Restoration the way is clear for Dryden and Pope and the classical poetry of reason and correctness. The steady growth which we can follow in these facsimiles towards a plain, clear, ordered hand is at once an image and a result of this evolution.

ROBIN FLOWER.

Old Scotch Songs and Poems. Phonetically Spelt and Translated by Sir JAMES WILSON, K.C.S.I. Oxford University Press. 1927. Pp. 463. 18s.

To the late Sir James Wilson we owe not only three exceedingly interesting monographs on Scottish dialects, but an edition of Burns' Scottish Poems which has given to students born south of Tweed a new pleasure in their reading. The attractive book before us forms a companion volume to the latter work.

Even as a collection of a hundred fine songs and poems the book has value. Of the authors included, Lady Nairne rightly heads the list; for Burns had already had a volume to himself, and *Jock o'Hazeldean* standing alone reminds us that one does not read Scott in selections.

The section entitled "Most Popular Old Songs by Known Authors" covers a period which may be indicated by mention of three names, Robert Sempill, Allan Ramsay, Lady John Scott. Following this are two sections containing Old Songs and Poems of unknown or disputed authorship. Here *Chrysts-Kirk of the Grene* stands in worthy company.

But the author's aim was less to offer a treasury of fine song, than to contribute to the right understanding and appreciation of the Scottish vernacular.

Accordingly, he has added to every poem, and on the opposite page, a careful phonetic transcription in the appropriate dialect, and in the "broadest" form of that dialect; and at the foot of every page he has given a literal translation into Standard English. The breadth of Sir James' investigations may be gauged when one notes that some sixteen dialects or sub-dialects are here represented.

In his aim of helping the readers and singers of these songs "to give each song a thoroughly Scottish character instead of making it half English and half Scotch," the author had chiefly in mind the needs of his fellow Scots. But the phonetic script which he has employed, even though it is not in all details sufficiently precise to enable a Southerner to attain perfect accuracy in reproducing the sounds described, will yet be a very real help to a wide public on both sides of the border.

Whether students of dialect or lovers of song, we all owe a debt to the man who gave us this delightful book.

J. H. G. GRATTAN.

Elizabethan Psychology and Shakespeare's Plays. By RUTH
LEILA ANDERSON. University of Iowa Studies. 1927.
Pp. 182. \$1.50.

MISS ANDERSON's intention in this thesis is to explain the principles of Elizabethan psychology in their bearing on Shakespeare's plays.

She has collected a large number of extracts from contemporary treatises and set them beside corresponding passages from Shakespeare, the whole being gathered into nine sections. Some of the parallels are illuminating, as when Miss Anderson suggests that the casket scenes in the *Merchant of Venice* are built upon a current theory of knowledge and desire, so that the lottery becomes a successful and plausible method of selecting a husband of the right character for Portia; her father, therefore, was more intelligent than is usually supposed. Or again, the theory that man loves because he can see an image of himself in others explains to some extent the notable soliloquies of Richard III and Edmund; by deliberately refusing kinship with their fellow men, they renounced the natural ties which control men's actions. There are many such passages which show how keenly Shakespeare and his contemporaries attempted to find some satisfying explanation for the vagaries of human character and behaviour. The tragedies, as was to be expected, are most quoted; next in importance being *Troilus and Cressida*. Miss Anderson has overlooked *The Taming of the Shrew* which contains a good deal of applied psychology (e.g. Induction, ii. 130-141; iv. ii. 172-214).

Miss Anderson's thesis is more valuable in its parts than as a whole. She seems to have been overwhelmed by the quantity of the material, so that the principles of Elizabethan psychology are lost in a mass of detail. Nevertheless, by calling attention to this somewhat neglected branch of Elizabethan thought she has made a useful contribution to Elizabethan scholarship.

G. B. H.

Shakespeare and Demi-Science. Papers on Elizabethan Topics.

By FELIX E. SCHELLING. Oxford. 1927. Pp. viii + 221.
10s. 6d.

THIS collection of papers delivered on various occasions is the first of a series issued by the University Press of Pennsylvania, who are to be congratulated not only on the handsome production of the volume but on choosing a book which is literary rather than, to use the author's phrase, "class-room matter."

The book, indeed, is more valuable as a record of Professor

Schelling's mind than of his scholarship, which has been amply proved elsewhere. He is conservative in his outlook, and refreshingly ironical in his comments on certain recent developments of Elizabethan criticism and scholarship, such as "Demi-science" (or the psychological approach); nor has he much admiration for the ingenuity of the disintegrators of the Shakespearean canon. In other papers, especially "Ben Jonson and the Classical School" and "Sidney's sister, Pembroke's mother," he is pleasantly critical. But the paper which will provoke most thought, at least amongst those who try to teach the appreciation of literature, is the last and least academic—"America's Elizabethan heritage"; for here Professor Schelling is speaking from his long experience as a teacher. Nominally he is comparing certain traits which he finds to be common between Elizabethan England and modern America; but the essay is at the same time an expression of his creed as an American scholar, confident of the genius of the American people, and convinced of the supreme value of its democracy. He ends with these words: "What remains in our American life is a strong, moving tide, able to carry on its bosom proud argosies, to tend ever onward, purifying as it flows, whatever the tributary streams that trouble its course for the moment, and tinge the clearness of its waters. With our experiment in free government a success, the world turns over a new page. Why then, O why, do we still shrink and tremble to assume the moral, the spiritual, the intellectual leadership that is ours?"

G. B. HARRISON.

Shakespeare's Stratford. By EDGAR I. FRIPP. Oxford University Press. 1928. Pp. x+86. 2s. 6d.

ALL students of Shakespeare should possess Mr. Fripp's little book, in which he summarises the places of interest in Stratford as Shakespeare knew it and gives some account of its chief inhabitants. It was a very live place and full of vivid characters, such as young Richard Tyler, who at twenty-two ran off with the daughter of Master Richard Woodward, to the lasting indignation of the girl's grandfather; or Badger and Barnhurst, both neighbours of the Shakespeares, who could not abide each other, for the one was

a Catholic and the other a Puritan ; or Alexander Aspinall, M.A., the schoolmaster who, in his forties, married a widow and presented her with a pair of gloves for which Shakespeare wrote a posy ; or the Combes, and especially hard-fisted John Combe, the bachelor ; or Dr. John Hall, Shakespeare's son-in-law, who was a zealous churchwarden as well as a famous physician. The book is full of interesting details, and illustrated with nearly forty excellent photographs, and a most fascinating plan of the town in the sixteenth century showing where each of the chief inhabitants lived. The price is half a crown. The only serious complaint is that the book is too short ; but perhaps Mr. Fripp will be persuaded to write the story of Shakespeare's Stratford at length.

G. B. HARRISON.

Thomas Heywood. A Study in the Elizabethan Drama of everyday life. By OTELIA CROMWELL. Yale Studies in English. New Haven : Yale University Press. London : Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1928. Pp. viii + 234. 10s. 6d.

THOMAS HEYWOOD is in many ways the most typical of the Elizabethan journeymen-playwrights, and in that fact lies his real importance. Though his work exhibits certain peculiarities of style and certain characteristic features of sentiment and tone which make his hand fairly easy to detect, his plays are not of a kind that require or repay an elaborate analysis of characterisation, dramaturgy, sentiment, or philosophy, such as Miss Cromwell has carried out. They are all lengths cut from the same web, and their differences are the results rather of different plots and fashions than of calculation or purpose. To regard them otherwise is to consider them too nicely, too seriously, even too sentimentally. Miss Cromwell's limitation of her survey to the plays which present "in plot, characterisation, or general atmosphere, Elizabethan England," implies that we do not meet the same bourgeois sentimentalist in the foreign and classical plays as well. In discussing the more tangible details, Heywood's career, his sources, and the like, Miss Cromwell has not attempted to add anything new. In the American manner she has concentrated on her own limited area and, if one does not find her chapters on Heywood's realism and technique too minute

and analytic, she will be given the credit of having produced careful work.

A. M. C.

The Catullian Influence in English Lyric Poetry, circa 1600-1650. By JOHN BERNARD EMPEROR (University of Missouri Studies, iii, 3). University of Missouri, Columbia, U.S.A. 1928. Pp. 133. \$1.25.

THE results of a useful investigation are here given in an engaging form. About forty poets of the period have been searched for traces of the influence of Catullus, and if the positive result is meagre, the thesis will still be valuable to editors. Catullus' "Vivamus mea Lesbia atque amemus" was very widely known and translated; some other of his love-poems and epithalamia were echoed by English lyricists. But except by a few poets, such as Herrick, Campion, Jonson and Lovelace, his other work does not appear to have been much known.

Mr. Emperor confesses that in choosing passages from our poets in which the influence of Catullus may be surmised, he has preferred to include, rather than to exclude, doubtful cases. Thus passages on the "vine and elm" are included, though some at least may have been suggested rather by Horace than Catullus. One clear case where the net has been spread too wide is Daniel's line quoted on p. 31: "For light cares speak, when mighty griefs are dumb," a rendering of a much-quoted line of Seneca.¹

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

¹ The following early instance of interest in Catullus is not strictly germane to Mr. Emperor's book. William Temple, later the friend of Sir Philip Sidney and eventually Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, in his *Epistolæ de P. Rami Dialectica contra Iohannis Piscatoris responsionem defensio* (Cambridge, 1584) thanks Piscator (p. 203) for having inscribed in a book sent to him an epigram in hendecasyllabics: "Quod libello ad me misso inscripsisti epigramma elegantissimis phaleuciis comprehensum, cepi ex eo (ornatissime Piscator) non mediocrem voluptatem: . . . quod sic afficiar ingenio Poëtæ, ut potius Catullum aliquem, quam Piscatorem loqui existimem. In eo certè vicit Catulli lepidam illam & delicatam Musam epigramma tuum quod tantum tribuat amoris Socratico, id est, ut ego interpretor, studio exquirendæ ac disceptandæ veritatis. Ille fere totus est in decantandis suis Lesbiiis. Non ignoro tamen lusisse eum per quidem scitis versibus multa de amore: sic, ut cum reliquis rebus deferat plurimum, amoris profectò concedat omnia. Sed amor iste ejusmodi est ei ut nihil sapiat præter Lesbiam. Quod cum ita sit, utcunque par alioqui phaleuciorum elegancia fuerit, dabit veniam, si ipsum á te, Romanum nempe á Germano, Catullum á Piscatore subjecti argumenti dignitate superari contendam."

Samuel Butler, Satires and Miscellaneous Poetry and Prose. Edited by RENÉ LAMAR, M.A. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1928. Pp. xxii+504. 15s. net.

THIS carefully edited volume is the third and last of the Cambridge University Classics edition which offers us for the first time a complete text of Butler. It is mainly based on R. Thyer's admirable *Genuine Remains in Verse and Prose of Mr. Samuel Butler* (1759) and the MSS. in the British Museum. Mr. Lamar has done well scrupulously to reject almost the entire contents of *The Posthumous Works of Mr. Samuel Butler*, the successive editions of which—that of 1754 is marked on the title-page as the sixth edition—are a tribute to the commercial value of a great name. No pieces are included in this volume of the authenticity of which the editor has not completely satisfied himself. There is quite enough inferior work extant that is unquestionably genuine to test our patience and Butler's reputation. Hazlitt's comment on *Hudibras*, "that the fault of Butler's poem is not that it has too much wit, but that it has not an equal quantity of other things," is relevant to many of the less well-known poems and some of the prose pamphlets.

Moreover, the richly allusive and vigorously colloquial qualities of Butler at his most effective demand, for the ordinary reader at least, a body of explanatory notes, which is unfortunately beyond the scope of the present edition. Thyer attempted, rather sketchily, to provide something of the kind, and the need is greater to-day. His notes, expanded and brought up to date with the addition of a short glossary, would have been very welcome.

But Mr. Lamar has accomplished his task within the limits of his terms of reference, and has completed a definitive edition of the most adroit of English satirists.

It is not easy to-day to read Butler in bulk. One must be inoculated with small doses of him for a long time before one becomes sufficiently seasoned to be tolerant of his faults. He is much stronger in attack than in defence; perhaps there was little he cared for sufficiently to defend. His very commonsense is at times a species of frenzy. Even in his own lifetime his methods were surpassed and made obsolete by Dryden. Swift and Prior may have learned lessons from him, but they were not his literary successors. He left none. A world that would have satisfied Butler

would have been a world made safe for mediocrity. In him the older type of satire is seen at its most brilliant and for the last time. It is appropriate that John Aubrey the antiquary was one of his pall-bearers.

H. V. D. DYSON.

Milton on Education. By O. M. AINSWORTH. The Tractate of Education with supplementary extracts from other writings of Milton. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1928. Pp. xiii+370. 12s. 6d. net.

NOR much can be said of Milton's twelve pages on education, and the little that is to be said has been said long ago. Professor Ainsworth has therefore hit upon the idea of building a big volume of extracts from Milton's prose chiefly, with a few passages from the poems, round the *Tractate of Education*.

This makes quite a good introduction to Milton's prose. Professor Ainsworth might be charged with having brought into his volume more than three-fourths of his matter without any real justification in so far that it has nothing to do with education. But he would probably plead guilty. His aim has been to produce an interesting volume of selections, chosen partly from his own particular angle as an educationalist, but omitting nothing that interested him in Milton's prose. He has certainly succeeded, and this volume can be recommended to all budding Miltonic scholars.

DENIS SAURAT.

A Noble Rake. The Life of Charles, Fourth Lord Mohun, being a study in the historical background of Thackeray's *Henry Esmond*, by ROBERT STANLEY FORSYTHE, Ph.D., Professor of English in the University of North Dakota. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1928. Pp. xviii+310. \$3.50.

WE are told by the author of this book that it grew out of a footnote to Lord Macaulay's well-known description of the death of William

Mountford the actor. From this statement and from the title-page one might suppose that it is one of the numerous pieces of unnecessary bookmaking by means of which Doctorates of Philosophy are too often gained on both sides of the Atlantic. Such a judgment, however, would be entirely wrong. Professor Forsythe has done a really valuable piece of work, and he has done it in a thoroughly workmanlike and unostentatious manner. One purpose fulfilled by his book is the piecing together of the first account of the career of the fourth Lord Mohun based upon really careful and unbiassed investigation. Mohun was by no means a good man, but he was detested by his political enemies, the Tories, and Professor Forsythe has shown how Tory malice and inaccurate historians have made him out to be much worse than he really was. Chapter II of *A Noble Rake* deserves to be carefully studied by all who are proposing to undertake literary or historical research dealing with the period in question. It contains a most salutary exposure of the extraordinary inaccuracies which are to be found even in works that are generally supposed to be thoroughly reliable.

But the most interesting function of *A Noble Rake* is to give a clear account of the historical events which Thackeray used for the background of his famous novel. *Henry Esmond* is one of the triumphs of historical fiction, and the brilliant art of its author easily misleads the reader into thinking that he is reading history instead of fiction. Professor Forsythe has shown with remarkable skill how Thackeray manipulated and rearranged his material to suit the purposes of his art, treating it with a freedom comparable to that with which Shakespeare treated the sources of his chronicle plays. It is a fascinating study in the methods of a great novelist, and also an act of justice to the rather rakish and unintelligent nobleman, who has been transformed partly by biassed and inaccurate history, and partly by brilliant fiction, into something like the legendary type of the wicked lord of the eighteenth century. There is a great wealth of biographical information in Professor Forsythe's long footnotes (for which he confesses a weakness) and in his important appendices. The book is pleasantly produced by the Harvard University Press, and is excellently illustrated with fifteen reproductions of contemporary prints. There is also a good index, in which the great Lord Macaulay appears rather strangely as "Macaulay of Rothley, Thomas first Baron."

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

The Plays and Poems of Richard Brinsley Sheridan. Edited with Introductions, Appendices and Bibliographies by R. CROMPTON RHODES. Oxford : Basil Blackwell. 1928. Vol. I, pp. xvi+358 ; Vol. II, pp. 363 ; Vol. III, pp. 365. 63s. net.

IN the preface to this substantial edition of Sheridan's plays and poems Mr. Crompton Rhodes explains that it has been his object "to reproduce, with introductions, appendices, and bibliographies, the most authentic texts, together with any variant readings of authority." The edition, therefore, stands or falls by the degree of its success in the fulfilment of this programme. It may be said at once, then, that the introductions, and to a certain extent the bibliographies and appendices also, have been extremely well done. It must be added that the choice of texts is far from satisfactory.

It is by no means clear what Mr. Rhodes understands by an "authentic text." *The School for Scandal* is a case in point : on the one hand, a preliminary "Note" states that the text printed represents "the last complete revision of the comedy ever made by Sheridan" ; on the other hand, the "Introduction" to the play distinctly promises "the full and genuine text as it was spoken at Drury Lane on the first night." The first performance of *The School for Scandal* was in 1777, but there is evidence that Sheridan was revising the play until at least as late as 1799 ; a contradiction, therefore, seems to be involved. There is a similar confusion about what does, and what does not, constitute for Mr. Rhodes a "variant reading of authority." In *A Trip to Scarborough* he records exactly one variant, in *The Duenna* there are four, in *The Critic* there is not even one ; in *St. Patrick's Day*, on the other hand, there are over forty. And this is the more surprising because only one version of *St. Patrick's Day* seems to be originally attributable to Sheridan, whereas there are two or more authoritative versions of each of the other plays. It is difficult to understand, also, the grounds on which Mr. Rhodes chooses the editions from which to collect his variant readings. Why is it, for example, that the variants in *St. Patrick's Day* do not include any from the Dublin edition of 1789 or the Larpen manuscript of the play ?

It is not too much to say that the preparation of the text of a dramatist like Sheridan requires a procedure more or less as

follows: (1) an analysis of the extant texts of each play with a view to discovering their origin and isolating the text which embodies what seem to be the author's latest corrections; (2) a selection of the best edition, or manuscript, of this text; (3) a collation of the selected edition with all the editions of the same text, other than reprints, and with the best editions of the other texts. Mr. Rhodes offends against all of these canons and almost all the time, though it is perhaps his offences of omission which are the most serious. There is no excuse for his neglect of the editions of *The Rivals*, *The Duenna* and *A Trip to Scarborough*, published in Mrs. Inchbald's *The British Theatre*, Dibdin's *The London Theatre*, Oxberry's *The New English Drama* and Dolby's *British Theatre*. These editions, and the equally neglected editions of *St. Patrick's Day* by Byrne (Dublin, 1789), of *The Duenna* by Longworth (New York, 1808), of *The School for Scandal* by Gaine (New York, 1786), and of *The Forty Thieves* by Longworth (New York, 1808) and Turner (Boston, 1810), are essential to the establishment of a satisfactory text of Sheridan. The case is much the same with the important manuscript versions of several of the plays. It appears that Mr. Rhodes has not even consulted the Larpent manuscripts in the Henry E. Huntington Library in California, although photostats are obtainable and the manuscripts provide the best texts extant of *St. Patrick's Day* and *The Camp*, and some extremely interesting versions of *The Rivals*, *A Trip to Scarborough*, *The Critic*, and the *Verses to the Memory of Garrick*. Mr. Rhodes is peculiarly perverse over *The School for Scandal*. It is his declared object to reproduce the play from the Crewe MS., which Moore asserts to be the last revised by Sheridan, but instead of printing the actual manuscript (which has been on the market several times in the last few years and is presumably easily accessible) we are presented with a copy of the Dublin edition of 1799 which Moore partially collated with the manuscript in 1819. The procedure is the more strange because Mr. Rhodes is quite aware that Moore's collation "was for his private information, not as a preparation to edit a classical text; he ignored—no doubt as obvious—a number of misprints, verbal transpositions, and the like."

Mr. Rhodes, naturally, does not escape the nemesis of these, and other, omissions. There are nine plays in all in his three volumes—*The Rivals*, *St. Patrick's Day*, *The Duenna*, *A Trip to Scarborough*, *The School for Scandal*, *The Camp*, *The Critic*, *The Forty Thieves*

and *Pizarro*—and of the nine only one, *Pizarro*, is altogether satisfactory from the textual point of view. The others are all more or less defective. *The Rivals* and *A Trip to Scarborough* follow the text of a penultimate revision by Sheridan; *St. Patrick's Day*, *The Camp* and *The Forty Thieves* reproduce the corrupt and garbled text of a piratical publisher; and *The Duenna* and *The Critic* are based on the second-best editions. It is a melancholy reflection upon modern editorial methods that the texts of the collected edition of Sheridan which was issued by John Murray in 1821 are actually preferable on the whole to Mr. Rhodes's.

It is a pleasure to turn from the confusion of Mr. Rhodes's texts to the "Introductions" and "Appendices" which fill so many of his pages. Mr. Rhodes leaves little or nothing to be desired as a critic and a commentator. The skill and industry which have gone to the excavation and assembling of the relevant information are remarkable, and the critical discussions which precede each of the plays are both learned and acute. The "Introduction" to *The Critic*, in particular, is a model of what such things should be. I have only to regret in Mr. Rhodes, in his rôle of commentator, a certain lack of interest in the theatrical history of some of the plays. Sheridan was a manager, after all, as well as a dramatist, and the original productions of several at least of his plays may plausibly be considered in the light of the final touches of the master's hand. Mr. Rhodes is inclined especially to take the original casts on trust. It is to be regretted that he has repeated the mistakes about the casts of *St. Patrick's Day* and *The Camp* which were made in the early editions. The cast which he gives of *St. Patrick's Day* is not that of May 2, but of November 8, 1775, and the omissions in *The Camp* might have been supplied by consulting *The Lady's Magazine* for October 1778.

F. W. BATESON.

The Merope of George Jeffreys as a Source of Voltaire's *Mérope*. By THOMAS EDWARD OLIVER. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Vol. XII. No. 4. Urbana: Illinois. 1927. Pp. 111. \$1.00.

WHEN Professor Oliver was engaged on an edition of Voltaire's *Mérope* his attention was drawn to the dedicatory introduction,

where Voltaire paid tribute to his Italian predecessor and strongly criticised the author of an English *Merope*, whom, however, he did not name. Knowing Voltaire's practice of lauding himself by disparaging others, Professor Oliver resolved to investigate the matter, and hence this edition.

The English author was George Jeffreys, whose play when acted in 1731 met with little approval, for on the second night the audience was dismissed without a performance taking place. Nevertheless when the 1754 edition of Jeffreys' works was printed, he made a spirited answer to Voltaire and accused him of plagiarism. As Jeffreys' play is not easily accessible, Professor Oliver prints it here, taking the 1754 edition as the basis of the text and noting any variants found in the 1731 edition. In the footnotes the relation of Voltaire and Jeffreys to Maffei is shown, and also their relation to each other. It must be confessed that this triangular relationship is somewhat bewildering at first, but in his introduction Professor Oliver summarises the facts very clearly. Although he himself admits that not all the arguments are equally strong, he concludes that Voltaire did know Jeffreys' play, that he did borrow ideas from it, and that he sought to conceal his indebtedness under a smoke-screen of unjust criticism. The case which Professor Oliver makes out is certainly worth consideration.

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

The Man of Feeling. By HENRY MACKENZIE, edited with an Introduction by HAMISH MILES. The Scholartis Press. 1928. Pp. 208. 7s. 6d. net.

HENRY MACKENZIE'S *Man of Feeling*, first published in 1771, is a book of which most students of English literature have probably heard, but which comparatively few are likely to have seen, and thanks are due to Mr. Hamish Miles and the Scholartis Press for giving us the opportunity of reading it in such an admirable form as this. It is certainly a book which should be read, if only on account of the problem which its success offers. How was it that a work by an unknown writer, so inadequate in its opening, so clumsy in its development, and so patently absurd in its conclusion, leapt into such instant popularity and maintained this popularity for so many

years? The curious imagination of a manuscript rescued from a curate who had already used a great part of it for gun-wads may excuse the episodic nature of the story, but hardly adds to its literary merit, and there is little in the writing, in the character drawing, or even in the philosophy to entitle the book to a permanent place in our literature. And yet it remains oddly readable; more readable, I think, than much that is in every respect better. May not the secret of its success have been that it was, in a way, a relief? Every now and then in the history of our literature there appears a book which seems to owe its success to its representing a reaction from the current manner. The hero or heroine is a kind of anti-hero or anti-heroine. In a time of heroic heroes he may be a coward, among well-born heroes he may be a peasant, among clever heroes he may be an amiable fool; or in a time of beauteous heroines she may be plain; but always he or she is something new and different. Mackenzie's Harley is so far from being a hero of the ordinary type that he is a simpleton and a failure.¹ He belongs to the group of unheroic heroes and heroines which comprises such very different people as Sir Perceval, Falstaff, Moll Flanders, Jane Eyre, and perhaps, indeed, Hamlet—people who are our apology for not ourselves being well-born or courageous or steadfast or even handsome. Harley is silly, and we sympathise; he infuriates us almost beyond bearing by his sentimentality, and we cannot help liking him; we are sorry when he dies, though he was plainly unfit to live.

In a pleasantly written introduction, Mr. Hamish Miles has set down all that it seems needful to know concerning Mackenzie and the book on which his fame rests.

R. B. McK.

Nature and the Country in English Poetry of the First Half of the Eighteenth Century. By C. E. DE HAAS, Litt.D.; H. J. PARIS. Amsterdam. 1928. Pp. iv+301. 10s.

THIS is a careful and useful compilation, especially in its tracing of the development of ideas and the conflicting tendencies in public

¹ Is it fantastic to see in the success of *When Winter Comes*, with its likeable but inefficient hero Mark Sabre, a parallel to that of a *Man of Feeling*?

taste. There are a few points in which one might differ from or supplement Dr. de Haas's statements. It is odd that in contrasting Addison and Hughes on Gothic architecture (p. 38) he should not notice that Pope, as a famous passage in his Shakespeare shows, was on the side of Hughes. Philips's use of "well bedew'd" (p. 50) suggests that his admiration of Milton led him beyond the printed works to the study of *Baptistes* in the MS. which already belonged to Trinity College. "Lucasia," the friend and biographer of William Pattison, might be identified by further investigation, since Lucas has long been a well-known name in Sussex. Somerville's allusion to Salisbury Cathedral (p. 141) surely, from the context, refers to that glimpse which may be caught from the right spot on Salisbury Plains, when the trees are not allowed to grow and block the view. And that Blair's *Grave* with Blake's illustrations "has not quite lost its hold on the public" (p. 170) is due rather to Blake than to Blair. These are, however, minor details. It would be difficult to quarrel with most of Dr. de Haas's conclusions, and it is of real value to have together in his appendices the two versions of *Grongar Hill*, the three versions of *The Schoolmistress* and definite examples of Gray's debt in the *Elegy* to his predecessors.

E. C. B.

Keats's Shakespeare. A descriptive study based on new material. By CAROLINE F. E. SPURGEON. Oxford University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. 1928. Pp. viii + 178. 25s. net.

FORTUNE has thrown into Professor Spurgeon's lap two gifts which most happily enrich each other, and out of them Miss Spurgeon has made a book that every lover of Keats will want to possess. First came the discovery in Mr. George Armour's library at Princeton of Keats's copy of Shakespeare, the edition of Johnson and Stevens which he bought in April 1817, took South with him when he went away to write *Endymion*, and marked and annotated at different periods; and then came the chance of acquiring a lost sketch of Keats, supposedly made from the life by Severn on board the *Maria Crowther*.

This sketch, reproduced as frontispiece to the book, has a poignant

beauty. Keats is sitting in a great-coat, in some kind of deck chair, his hair lank and blown in wisps, his head sunk forward, his cheeks hollow, his eyes intent on a large folio volume which he reads propped on his knee. It is more than a realistic sketch of Keats as he looked on his last journey, ill, wasted and wretched. It is an image of the suffering human spirit in frail mortal body, wrapped in common human clothes; its beauty as moving as its passionate humanity.

Nothing could better open the way to an understanding of Keats's reading of Shakespeare. As he read he underlined and marked in the margin and annotated—we are given facsimiles of the more significant pages—and the interest of all this, as Professor Spurgeon rightly indicates, is as much biographical as literary. Shakespeare was for him a man speaking to men, not only a poet speaking to poets. Keats found a close analogy with his own tortured love for Fanny Browne in the experience of Shakespeare's Troilus, and the markings he made in his Folio copy of *Troilus and Cressida* fully bear this out. In the autumn of 1818, as he sat beside his dying brother Tom, he read *King Lear* to escape from the too painful pressure of his brother's pitiful suffering. In Act III, Scene iv, he stopped at the words *poore Tom*, underlined them and wrote in the margin: Oct. 4, 1818.

Keats had three ways of marking a passage: he underlined it, or he put a vertical mark in the margin, or he put two vertical marks. Each way indicates, Professor Spurgeon thinks, a different degree or kind of emphasis; she goes further and suggests why he marked particular passages. Whilst most of her suggestions are sound and she is never unduly dogmatic, yet the honest reader will protest that a number of other explanations would equally commend themselves. Apart from the few places where Keats's own word explains why he marked a passage (witness the note to *poore Tom*), we may guess for ever what his real reason was. Professor Spurgeon is certainly right in pointing out how closely Keats must have been reading *The Tempest* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* when he wrote *Endymion*, but her list of parallel passages includes some where the link seems flimsy. Thus, on the doubly marked lines of Ceres' blessing,

Spring come to you at the farthest
In the very end of harvest,

she writes: "One rather wonders why these so appeal to

him until one remembers the opening of *Endymion*, that poem begun

Now while the early budders are just new,
with the wish that

Autumn bold
With universal tinge of sober gold
Be all about me when I make an end."

It may be that this association was in Keats's mind, but a hundred others are possible. Keats was not only thinking of *Endymion* when he read *The Tempest*. The truth is, critics and editors are called upon nowadays to do more than they ought or can. We want all our questions answered before they are asked, our problems both stated and solved. A scholar of Professor Spurgeon's standing ought not to be required to put together an exhaustive list of parallel passages to save lazy readers the trouble of using their own wits.

In twelve places on the pages reproduced, Keats makes a textual emendation or note: in ten of these his emendation had already been made by earlier scholars; the two which appear to be original are neither necessary nor happy. Yet Professor Spurgeon thinks that "if Keats had taken a hand with the great Shakespearian emendators the results would have been valuable"; and she bases this conviction on his manner of dealing with the crux at *Tempest*, I, ii, 100:

Who having into truth

for which Keats, after Hanmer, writes:

Who loving an untruth.

"For various reasons," she is inclined to think that Keats had not consulted an earlier edition and that this emendation was his own idea. Professor Spurgeon is so sound a scholar that we do not doubt her various reasons, but they should have been stated. Judging from the evidence before us we can do no more than note that Keats took an interest in the minutiae of Shakespeare's text which may, but ought not to, surprise us. He was a born student if he was not a scholar.

Keats's incidental notes on the plays themselves and his retorts to Johnson's criticisms are the true riches of the volume. Might not Professor Spurgeon have done better to set these together as the main text of her book, instead of leaving us to find some of them interwoven in her essay, and others standing as footnotes to the

reprint she has given, at the end, of Keats's marked passages from five important plays? In the facsimiles Keats's handwriting is not always nor easily legible.

Keats has a happy method of rebutting Johnson's summary criticisms at the end of each play. He writes underneath Johnson's note an apt quotation or misquotation from the play itself. Thus under Johnson's cold appraisal of *Midsummer Night's Dream*, he writes, "Such tricks hath *weak* imagination" and "The clamorous owl that hoots at our quaint spirits."

Johnson's famous criticism of *As You Like It* which ends with the regret that Shakespeare "by hastening to the end suppressed the dialogue between the usurper and the heroine and lost an opportunity of exhibiting a moral lesson . . . worthy of his highest powers," provokes from Keats the query "Is *Criticism* a true thing?"

The dogmatism of a professional critic is one thing, the casual utterances of a poet another. Two of his own scribbled notes, rightly praised by Miss Spurgeon, will illustrate the depth and range of his own critical vision.

On Antony's words to Cleopatra,

Fie wrangling queen!
Whom everything becomes, to chide, to laugh,
To weep. . . .

Keats comments, "How much more Shakespeare delights in dwelling upon the romantic and wildly natural than upon the monumental! See *Winter's Tale*, 'When you do dance,' etc." We are reminded of an equally significant note of his, in another place, on Milton's instinct for "statuary."

On Troilus' strange words, in the Folio,

I have (as when the Sunne doth light a-scorne)
Buried this sigh, in wrinkle of a smile:

Keats writes:

"Tis certain that the Commentators have contrived to twist many beautiful passages into commonplaces as they have done with respect to "a scorn" which they have hocus-pocus'd into "a storm," thereby destroying the depth of the simile—taking away all the surrounding Atmosphere of Imagery and leaving a bare and unapt picture. Now, however beautiful a comparison may be for a bare aptness—Shakespeare is seldom guilty of one—he could not be content with the "sun lighting a storm," but he gives us Apollo in the act of drawing back his head and forcing a smile upon the world—"the Sun doth light a-scorn"

Professor Spurgeon has greatly enhanced the value of her book by adding a reprint of Keats's marks and notes on *Troilus and Cressida* in his Folio copy, now in the Dilke Collection at Hampstead. We owe her all gratitude for having enabled us to follow Keats, more closely than we ever dreamed possible, in his reading of the poet who had most to do with the quickening of his own genius.

HELEN DARBISHIRE.

Papers on Shelley, Wordsworth, and Others. By J. A. CHAPMAN. Oxford University Press. 1929. Pp. v+171. Price 6s. net.

If any one wants to have his appreciation of poetry freshened and renewed, he should read Mr. Chapman's essays. Mr. Chapman believes that a critic's words should "more fully reveal what poetry is." He does not theorise about poetry. "Whatever is the true theory of poetry, one might be so extravagant as to think, *le bon Dieu* will look after it, and keep it for us." Nor does he add to our store of knowledge. The only thing he wants to do is to read poetry better and to make others do the same. His method depends almost entirely upon quotation: great poetry put beside poetry exquisite but trivial; "incantation," childish poetry, beside poetry with such experience behind it that after two hundred years men have hardly grown to its stature. He brings out a quotation like a man who has lived with it and sets it for us in the light of that companionship. His faith is that great poetry is the product of great living, and great living is needed for its adequate reading. Mr. Chapman never forgets that to read poetry is a high adventure: he shows that only by generations of study is it fully appreciated, and therefore a poet is never rightly appreciated by his contemporaries until one man has taken the requisite trouble.

Mr. Chapman is a disciple of Matthew Arnold, "the man with probably the deepest insight into the facts of poetry of any Englishman there has ever been." If he owes his training to Arnold, he does credit to his master. For Mr. Chapman, unlike most modern critics, does criticise. He can lay his finger on the exact point where a poem begins to go wrong; he knows, in a good poem, what is not so good. His taste is sure; and if he does use the same quotation from Wordsworth once to show that modern writings can

occasionally be set beside the Gospels, and once as an illustration of mere rhetoric, I suppose that few of us are above uncertainties of mood in matters so subtle. The charm of his thought, and of his style, lies in its scrupulous sincerity.

A. E. DODDS.

Folklore in the English and Scottish Ballads. By LOWRY CHARLES WIMBERLEY. University of Chicago Press, U.S.A.; Cambridge University Press. 1928. Pp. xiii + 466. 25s. net.

PROFESSOR WIMBERLEY of the University of Nebraska has set before himself the task of investigating the folklore content of the English and Scottish Ballads. In the present volume he treats elaborately of superstitions; and a second volume, now in preparation, will deal with rites and ceremonies.

The work so carried out is to be valued both for itself and for its significance. Since Child completed his harvesting of English and Scottish Ballads, gathering so thoroughly that he left almost nothing to the gleaners, the vast labour of threshing out the grain seems to have dismayed all but a few Continental scholars: Fehr (1900), Jaehde (1905), Rüdiger (1907), Wagner (1910), Ehrke (1914), and others, have made attempts of one kind or another to separate out, classify and study this or that aspect or group of the folklore elements embedded in the Ballads. Meanwhile the problem of Ballad origins, which has retained through a century and a half its peculiar fascination, and its insolubility, has attracted a disproportionate amount of the vigour devoted—especially by American scholars—to Ballad study; and the matter of the Ballads has been correspondingly neglected. Professor Wimberley's work, when complete, will have gone far to restore the balance, and doubtless to invite others to follow where he has pioneered.

From its beginnings literature is honeycombed with superstitions: Homer tells of Autolycus using a charm as a styptic for blood, and of Telemachus sneezing a blessing on his mother's words. But of the Ballads, whether they be regarded as falling within the category of literature or outside it, it is scarcely too much to say that they are built of superstitions: of the secular creeds inherent in the primitive mind. The whole tragedy of a ballad can pivot on the single idea that it is a fatal error on the part of a bridegroom to

"forget to speak to her brother John" when wooing. Certainly, amongst the problems that Professor Wimberley has had to face, there has not been that of paucity of material.

The problem of classifying his material has, he admits, not been easy to solve; but it is obviously better to overlap subjects than to leave gaps. The volume is divided into four parts. They deal respectively with (i) "The Pagan Otherworld"—primitive ideas of the Hereafter, the journey thither, where it is, and what it is like; (ii) "Pagan Otherworld Beings"—fairies, witches, ghosts; (iii) "The Otherworld Spell"—enchantment and disenchantment; and (iv) "The Christian Otherworld"—Heaven, Hell, and Purgatory. Under these headings are digested all traces of primitive beliefs discoverable in English and Scottish Ballad material; for, besides the 305 Ballads in Child's canon, Professor Wimberley dissects such addenda thereto as have been contributed by later collectors from current tradition in England and America. He supplies also, making no claim to be exhaustive, a number of valuable references to parallels in the balladry of other languages. The book, in short, parades in well-arranged formation all the material of the subject, rendering it for the first time easily available for experts in comparative anthropology and folk-psychology to collate and explore.

F. SIDGWICK.

Bibliography, Practical, Enumerative, Historical. An Introductory Manual. By HENRY BARTLETT VAN HOESEN, with the collaboration of FRANK KELLER WALTER. Illustrated. Charles Scribner's Sons: New York, London. 1928. Pp. xiii+519. 27s. 6d. net.

I FRANKLY admit that at first sight I disliked this book extremely. What good could there possibly be in what is described by the publishers as "a comprehensive work in compressed form covering the entire field of bibliography in all its aspects," and which on inspection proved to deal with such varied things as the formation of correct habits of reading, preparation of manuscripts for the press, publication—incidentally we learn that the usual royalty paid to an author in U.S.A. is 10 per cent., is this really so?—subject bibliographies, library science, special bibliographies, the history of

writing, printing, book-decoration and the like? It did not seem possible that writers who attempted to cover so vast a field could succeed in dealing efficiently with any part of it, an impression strengthened by a consideration of the "bibliographical appendix" which seems to have some quite odd inclusions and omissions.

Closer inspection has, however, convinced me that the book, in spite of inequalities, contains much that is of value. Few students engaged in any branch of research could fail to benefit by consulting it, though it is hardly a book for any but the most omnivorous to read through. That it is at times exasperating is less the fault of its authors than of its subject, or rather of the confusion of several subjects which are included under the term bibliography. The authors define bibliography as "the science of books." I am not quite sure in what sense one can have a "science" of material objects, but granting that one can, there seems to be a confusion of thought between books and the information contained in books. The purpose of many bibliographies and of most libraries is to facilitate the discovery and use not of *books*, but of information contained in books, and it is unfortunate that we have no word for the study of sources of information, whatever they may be, whether books, monuments or men. The fact that we have no such word tends on the one hand to strengthen the common idea that books are the sole sources of information, and on the other to obscure the fact that the treatment of "bibliographies" must be very different according to the purpose aimed at. That the authors fully recognise the danger of the confusion is clear from their note on p. 154, but they cannot help the fact that in a great part of the literature with which they are dealing the distinction between the "bibliography" as a list of books and as an index of information is not fully recognised.

The parts of this book which will be most useful to students are the account of the most important bibliographies of the various subjects which occupies pp. 46-132, and of the general reference books, special bibliographies, etc., occupying pp. 172-258, and the Bibliographical Appendix at the end, the latter especially for its references to recent American bibliographical work, information about which is extremely hard to come by in England. It would have been very helpful if the author had added some indication of the number of pages each work contains. As they themselves say, "If you have not seen a book . . . it is worth while to know whether it is an encyclopædic work or a ten-page pamphlet." It

is certainly very well worth while to know this when the work in question happens to be a foreign one and to obtain a sight of it will cost one a considerable expenditure of time and money. To be of real use to a student, a bibliography should, of all books not to be found in any decent library, invariably give the size, price and publisher. These things together will often give one a better notion of whether a book is likely to be of use to one than an average review.

In a few places a slight amount of touching-up would make things clearer. I doubt, for example, if any one who did not know the Browne system of library entry would get much light upon it from the description on p. 136.

In the Browne system each book has a "book-card," inserted in a pocket inside the cover, and two or more separate pockets for each borrower (according to the number of loans permitted to each individual). When a book is loaned, the book-card is inserted in one of the separate pockets and the pocket is filed by date.

Assuming that some words, such as "are provided" after "separate pockets" have been accidentally omitted, one sees glimpses of a system, but how does the librarian know what or how many books a borrower has out save by a complete search through the whole file of separate pockets?

It is interesting to know that the custom of indexing members of the peerage under their family name rather than under the title is an illustration of "English conservatism" (p. 145). Surely it is rather due to a common-sense objection to scattering a man's writings under two or more catalogue headings as he changes his title. His surname may well be the only permanent designation that he has.

On p. 150 the authors' choice of John Drinkwater's *Abraham Lincoln* as an instance of a book requiring in a library catalogue the addition of an indication that it is a play, not a biography, is an unfortunate one, for the words "A Play" happen to form part of the title, at any rate as the book was first issued.

Should another edition be called for, it would be well that the sections of the Bibliographical Appendix should be submitted to scholars with a special knowledge of the particular subjects. At present it is often very difficult to see any principle in the selection—especially is this so in the "English" section—and the placing

of certain items is clearly wrong. I am doubtful in what section I should expect to find Dr. Greg's *Calculus of Variants*, but I am quite sure that the one headed "History of Book-trade, Copyright, Censorship" is not the right place for it.

The final chapters on the history of writing, of printing, book-decoration, etc., are naturally in more readable form than the rest of the book and will provide useful summaries for those who have no opportunity of consulting more special works. It is a pity that the printing of the illustrations, rather a haphazard collection, as the authors seem to be aware, made it necessary to use a different paper from that of the rest of the book.

To sum up, the book is one which contains much that is useful and to which it would be well that every student who contemplates research should have access. On the other hand, it can, I think, hardly be recommended to beginners, nor is it, so far at any rate as English bibliographical work is concerned, by any means exhaustive.

R. B. McK.

Briefe von R. Rask an J. H. Halbertsma. Mit einem nordfriesischen Glossar von R. Rask. Bearbeitet von FRITZ BRAUN. Jena: Frommansche Buchhandlung. 1927. Pp. 77.

THIS book, which is an off-print from the collection of studies offered as a tribute to Professor Albert Leitzmann, was written to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of the Frisian Society at Leeuwarden, its object being to investigate the Frisian studies of the great Danish philologist, Erasmus Rask. With the aid of Rask's diary and his letters to the Dutch scholar Halbertsma, of which unfortunately so few appear to have been preserved, Dr. Braun in his introduction traces the growth of Rask's interest in Frisian. The two letters to Halbertsma which he prints, both dated 1830, illustrate not only Rask's detailed knowledge of Germanic philology, but also his remarkable command of idiomatic English. The glossary, edited from the manuscript in the Royal Library at Copenhagen, though it does not meet the demands of modern phonetics, reveals the same passion for accuracy as do Rask's letters.

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

The Year's Work in English Studies. Vol. VIII. 1927.

Edited for the English Association by F. S. BOAS and C. H. HERFORD. Oxford University Press, London: Humphrey Milford. 1929. Pp. 386. 10s. 6d. net (to members of the English Association, 3s. 6d.).

The Year's Work continues to grow in usefulness and in bulk, for though the last volume was slightly thinner than its predecessor this is the thickest of them all. The general character and arrangement of the work is, of course, the same as before, and the writers of the several chapters are identical with those in the previous volume with the single exception that Mr. Harry Sellers now contributes Chapter XIII, Bibliographica, in place of Mr. Arundell Esdaile, the pressure of whose duties as Secretary of the British Museum has made it impossible to continue the excellent summaries of bibliographical work which have appeared in the last five volumes. The Society is to be congratulated on finding so good a successor as Mr. Sellers.

An interesting innovation is made in this volume in the dropping of prefixes, such as Mr., Dr. or Prof. before the names of male persons. To retain Miss or Mrs. seems, however, to create an invidious distinction which may possibly be resented by some.¹ It would be greatly to the convenience of editors, and indeed of scholars generally, if *all* such designations were dropped in scholarly work. At present far too much time is spent in attempting to ascertain the correct style of scholars to whom reference is made, in the knowledge that error on this point may give serious offence.

As before, the only point which seems to me to call for criticism in the volume is the binding of paper boards, which is not strong enough for a book which one naturally desires to preserve.

R. B. McK.

OTHER BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED.

Letters from Brook Farm, 1844-1847. By MARIANNE DWIGHT.

With Portraits. Edited by AMY L. REED. Vassar College, New York. 1928. Pp. xvi + 191.

In the minds of English readers the story of Brook Farm belongs rather to the byways of social history than to literature; none the less, the record preserved in these letters is not without interest.

The letters were written by a member of the Brook Farm Association who took

¹ The rule does not seem to be carried out quite consistently, e.g. on p. 152 I notice "M. St. Clare Byrne" and "Mrs. C. C. Stopes."

an active part in its affairs. They contain many little details of the daily activities of the fraternity, productive, educational and recreative, and display a fresh enthusiasm for the ideals of communal life as proclaimed by Fourier and Emerson. We get hardly more than sidelights on the policies and personalities of the movement, and the flavour of the chronicle is thin; but in its naive way it gives a pleasant impression of the Association, and of the spirit of amiable optimism and the touching faith in the perfectibility of man by which the enterprise was inspired.

It is a far cry from Brook Farm to *Babbitt*; and Vassar may be held to have been justified in printing these letters. But it seems a pity that the book has no index.

H. R. H.

England from Wordsworth to Dickens. By R. W. KING. 1928. London: Methuen & Co. Pp. xv+240. 6s. net.

This anthology of nineteenth-century prose and verse, chosen as reflecting contemporary life and manners, is the sixth in the Series, *English Life in English Literature*. It is arranged in twelve sections, and contains extracts ranging from Burke on the French Revolution to the altogether delightful excerpt from Miss Firth, a fourteen-year old writer of succinct style, in whose schoolgirl diary appears the revealing entry: "May 24, 1813. The coughs had treacle-posset." The section on "National Characteristics" is interesting, and serves to show how little, on the whole, the Englishman's estimate of the national character has altered in the last hundred years.

This is a beguiling book, and one cannot but wish it twice as big, and regret with the editor the necessary omission of much fascinating material which he mentions, notably on the subject of "Royalty *en masse*." Having regard, indeed, to the restriction of space lamented by Mr. King, it is rather astonishing to find, alongside an extract from Wesley's *Journal*, in the section headed "Religion: The Church: Dissent," the opening lines of Keats's *Eve of St. Mark*. A few lines from one of the characteristic and now seldom-sung hymns of the period would seem to have a stronger claim for inclusion. There is a sensible index appended.

The Mourning Bride, Poems, and Miscellanies. By WILLIAM CONGREVE. (The World's Classics, No. 277.) 1928. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. Pp. xxvii+540. 2s. net.

With *The Comedies of William Congreve*, No. 276, in the series, this volume makes a complete edition, including letters, the editor being Mr. Bonamy Dobrée. The text throughout displays a care for accuracy and thoroughness of documentation to a degree which makes it seem almost shameful to buy this work for a paltry florin. Mr. Dobrée's introduction is written with his customary penetration and affectionate sympathy for the eighteenth century.

The Autobiography of Leigh Hunt. (The World's Classics, No. 329.) 1928. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. Pp. xii+572. 2s. net.

Mr. Edmund Blunden is the editor of this reprint from the edition of 1860, and contributes a sympathetic introductory essay, which is, indeed, a largely successful apology for Hunt's shortcomings. The *Autobiography*, so full of interest (and in some respects so irritating), of this man of letters who knew and might have told much more than he ever did, is a welcome addition to the series. A fairly comprehensive index is given.

L. F.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

CORNHILL MAGAZINE, May 1929—

Oscar Wilde at Oxford (G. T. Atkinson), pp. 559-64.

Letters to Her Sister, from Elizabeth Barrett Browning. I. (edited by Leonard Huxley), pp. 621-38.

Continued June, pp. 743-66.

———— June—

Tennyson a Hundred Years After (Laurie Magnus), pp. 660-70.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XI., June 1929—

Beowulf's Fight with Grendel, and its Scandinavian Parallels (R. W. Chambers), pp. 81-100.

The "Sonnettes" of Barnabe Googe (P. N. U. Harting), pp. 100-02.

LIBRARY, Vol. X., June 1929—

The Bibliography of Sir David Lindsay (Douglas Hamer), pp. 1-42.

The Early Editions of Thomas Dekker's *The Converted Courtesan*, or *The Honest Whore, Part I* (Matthew Baird), pp. 52-60.

The Christian Hero, by Richard Steele: A Bibliography (Rae Blanchard), pp. 61-72.

Travel and Topography in Eighteenth-Century England. Introduction (G. E. Fussell and Constance Goodman), pp. 84-103. Bibliographical.

LIFE AND LETTERS, Vol. II., May 1929—

Thyrsis (F. L. Lucas), pp. 344-60.

Rupert Brooke (Sybil Pye), pp. 373-86.

———— June—

T. S. Eliot and his Difficulties (E. M. Forster), pp. 417-25.

LONDON MERCURY, Vol. XX., July 1929—

Keats and his Predecessors: A Note on the *Ode to a Nightingale* (Edmund Blunden), pp. 289-92.

Erasmus Darwin (Alan Pryce-Jones), pp. 293-302.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XLIV., May 1929—

The Bancroft Manuscripts of Rossetti's Sonnets (Ruth Wallerstein), pp. 279-84.

Variant readings and two previously unpublished sonnets.

Did Keats Finish *Hyperion*? (J. H. Roberts), pp. 285-87.

Evidence against Mr. Murry's theory.

Notes on Professor Garrod's *Keats* (N. S. Bushnell), pp. 287-96.

The Date of Wordsworth's First Meeting with Hazlitt (A. F. Potts), pp. 296-99.

The First Review of Wordsworth's Poetry (J. A. S. Barry), pp. 299-302.

Favourable review in the *Gentleman's Magazine*.

A Letter of Coleridge (J. D. Rea), pp. 302-03.

To Hessey in 1824-5.

Burns and the Indies in 1788 (J. De L. Ferguson), pp. 303-05.

Correction of text of letter to Mrs. M'Lehose.

A Note on the Prosody of William Morris (J. J. Parry), pp. 306-09.

Suggested influence of Welsh metres.

The Semantics of "Child" (Archer Taylor), pp. 309-14.

Browning and Goethe (O. P. Rhyne), p. 327.

Note on *Rabbi ben Ezra*, ll. 1-3.

June—

The Sources of Poe's *Pit and the Pendulum* (D. L. Clark), pp. 349-56.

Gulliver's Travels and *Le Théâtre Italien* (W. A. Eddy), pp. 356-61.

Jonathan Swift's *A Voyage to Lilliput* and *The Thousand and One Quarters of an Hour, Tartarian Tales* of J. S. Gueulette (E. E. Rovillain), pp. 562-64.

A "Character" from Chaucer in a Seventeenth Century Satire (L. B. Wright), pp. 364-68.

New Actors of the Elizabethan Period (G. E. Bentley), pp. 368-72.

References in Church registers.

A Note on the Pagination of the First Folio (E. E. Willoughby), pp. 373-74.

Downe's Tribute to Mrs. Bracegirdle (Hazelton Spencer), p. 375.

Italian Actors in Elizabethan England (Winifred Smith), pp. 375-77.

Defoe's Conception of Poetry (Burns Martin), pp. 377-78.

An Equivalent for Daniel Defoe (C. E. Burch), p. 378.

Tom Brown and *Tristram Shandy* (W. A. Eddy), pp. 379-81.

The French Source of Two Early English Feminist Tracts (Rae Blanchard), pp. 381-83.

Treatise by Madame de Pringy.

Petowe's Continuation of *Hero and Leander* (G. P. Shannon), p. 383.

Three Thefts from Cleveland (G. Williamson), pp. 384-85.

By Vaughan, Benlowes and Marvell.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXIV., July 1929—

- The Trojan Legend in England. I. (A. E. Parsons), pp. 253-64.
 On the Independent Development of the Middle English Vowels in
 Early New English (W. S. Mackie), pp. 265-75.
 Eighteenth-Century French Taste and *The Beggar's Opera* (Sybil
 Goulding), pp. 276-93.
 "Indo-European" and "Indo-Germanic" (F. Norman), pp. 313-21.
Beowulf: the Nationality of Ecgðēow (Edith Wardale), p. 322.
 A Note on *Beowulf*, l. 2034 (Kemp Malone), pp. 322-23.
 Notes on *Cleanness* (P. G. Thomas), pp. 323-24.
 A New Lydgate Manuscript (Daisy E. Martin Clarke), pp. 324-28.
 Fragment in Exeter muniment room.
 The Evolution of the Term "Esemplastic" (P. L. Carver), pp. 329-31.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXVI., May 1929—

- The Forms and Functions of the Subjunctive in the Classical and
 Modern Languages (George O. Curme), pp. 387-99.
 Propriety in the Light of Linguistics (Klara H. Collitz), pp. 415-26.
 Figurative uses of verbs of motion.
 The Semantic Development of OE. *Cræft* (Samuel Kroesch),
 pp. 433-43.
 Kemble's *Salomon* and *Saturn* (Henning Larsen), pp. 445-50.
 Variations between the versions of 1845 (?) and 1848.
 The Analytic Future in Contemporary American Fiction (William
 F. Luebke), pp. 451-57.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Vol. 14, 1929—

- Over de Shylockfiguur, III. (R. Volbeda), pp. 274-81.

NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER, Vol. CV., April 1929—

- Thomas Percy's Bicentenary (Maurice McGrath), pp. 554-62.
 Note by Davidson Cook, May, pp. 719-20.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 156, May 4, 1929—

- Matthew Arnold: "Thyestean banquet" (W. H. J.), p. 316.

— May 11—

- The Site of the Churchyard of Gray's *Elegy* (J. B. McGovern),
 pp. 330-31.
 Replies by R. Bentley, June 1, pp. 394-95; by J. B. McGovern and
 H. Askew, June 15, p. 429.
 "Spike" (Shirley H. Harper), p. 340.
 Figurative meaning not in N.E.D. Reply by S. L. Ollard, June 8, pp. 408-9.

— May 25—

- The Authorship of *The Silver King* (A. de Ternant), pp. 369-70.
 Reply by P. Allen, June 15, p. 427; further note by A. de Ternant, July 13,
 p. 31.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 156, June 1—

Dickens : A Slip (H. W. F.), p. 386.

Reference to Swiss language in *Martin Chuzzlewit*, xvii. Also note on *Tale of Two Cities*, xiii, by J. Ardagh, p. 397.

———— June 15—

"Cheese" in Place-Names (A. Anscombe), pp. 419-20.

———— June 22—

Error in *Paradise Regained* (C. L. Barnes), p. 440.
Book I, l. 383.

———— July 20—

Earliest Critical Notice of Shakespeare (J. Denham Parsons), p. 39.

Transcript of Dedication of *Cenone and Paris*, 1594.

Verses by Warren Hastings (H. B.), pp. 40-42.

Concluded July 27, pp. 57-9.

Hudibras in *Rob Roy* : A Misquotation (E. H. Lendon), p. 43.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. VIII., April 1929—

The Philosophy of Thomas Traherne (Elbert N. S. Thompson),
pp. 97-112.Neo-Platonic Hymns by Thomas Taylor (Franklin P. Johnson),
pp. 145-56.English Literature, 1660-1800 : A Current Bibliography (R. S. Crane),
pp. 165-206.A Source for Barrie's *Peter Pan* (Lionel Stevenson), pp. 210-14.The Jamaica Insurrection and English Men of Letters (J. B. Heidler),
pp. 214-218.PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Vol. XLIV., June 1929—The Date, Author, and Sources of *The Owl and the Nightingale*
(Henry B. Hinckley), pp. 329-59.A Source for the Middle English Romance, *Athelston* (Albert C. Baugh),
pp. 377-82.An anecdote in Map's *De Nugis Curialium*.Conventions of Platonic Drama in the Heroic Plays of Orrery and
Dryden (Kathleen Lynch), pp. 456-71.

Shadwell and the Virtuosi (Claude Lloyd), pp. 472-94.

The Virtuoso and the Royal Society.Who was "Cenus" in the Poem *To the Memory of Mr. Congreve*?
(George G. Williams), pp. 495-500.Changing Taste in the Eighteenth Century : A Study of Dryden's
and Dodsley's Miscellanies (Raymond D. Havens), pp. 501-36.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 503

Some Sources of Goldsmith's *She Stoops to Conquer* (Gertrude v. A. Ingalls), pp. 565-68.

A Study of Clough's *Mari Magno* (Albert M. Turner), pp. 569-89.

Browning and Higher Criticism (William O. Raymond), pp. 590-621.

A Recent Theory of Ballad-Making (Louise Pound), pp. 622-30.

On Professor Gerould's theory.

The Drinking Academy and its attribution to Thomas Randolph (G. C. Moore Smith), pp. 631-33.

"T. Goodal" in *Sir Thomas More* (W. W. Greg), pp. 633-34.

REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAIN, Vol. VI., June 1929—

Quelques aspects de la fonction judiciaire d'après Hobbes (P. Baratier), pp. 406-11.

La poésie de John Freeman (Louis Bonnerot), pp. 412-19.

Kipling et les instincts primitifs (E. Thevenot), pp. 421-28.

Notes lexicologiques (J. Derocquigny), pp. 429-30.

Anglais *bêche-de-mer*; *dear* au sens de *loving*.

Une lettre de William Godwin (A. Koszul et G. Bresch), pp. 430-32.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, May 2, 1929—

The "1592" 8vo of *Tamburlane* (U. M. Ellis-Fermor), p. 362.

The Stratford Jubilee (A. H. Westwood), p. 362.

Note by L. F. Powell, May 16, p. 403.

The King's Players at Oxford (G. B. Harrison), p. 362.

Doughty's *Arabia Deserta* (Barker Fairley), p. 362.

Variations in title-page of first edition. Note by S. C. Roberts, May 9, p. 383.

English Studies (Edith J. Morley), p. 362.

Correction of errors in *The Year's Work in English Studies*.

Hogarth's Epitaph (R. W. Chapman), p. 362.

May 9—

Beowulf and Waterfall-Trolls (R. W. Chambers), p. 383.

Reply by Katherine M. Buck, May 16, p. 403.

Chaucer's Scrivener (Ramona Bressie), p. 383.

Possible identification. Further suggestions by J. M. Manly, May 16, p. 403, and Bernard M. Wagner, June 13, p. 474.

May 16—

Thomas Lovell Beddoes (Jack Lindsay), p. 403.

The Scottish Dictionaries (W. A. Craigie), p. 403.

May 23—

The English Jig (W. J. Lawrence), pp. 419-20.

Jig or puppets at Paris Garden?

Thomas Warton and the *Ode to Horror* (A. S. P. Woodhouse), p. 420.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, May 30—

Imitations of the *Ode to Evening* (A. S. P. Woodhouse), p. 436.

Reply by Davidson Cook, June 6, p. 454.

— June 6—

A Journey to the Western Islands (E. S. Roscoe), p. 454.

Discrepancy between the accounts of Johnson and Boswell.

— June 13—

Twelfth Night and the Gunpowder Plot (J. Dover Wilson), p. 471.

Note on III. i. 24-35.

New Light on Christopher Smart (Stuart Piggott), p. 474.

Another Shakespearian Test (C. L. Quinton), p. 474.

Use of hautbois. Replies by Peter Alexander, July 18, p. 576, and by W. J. Lawrence, July 25, p. 592.

A Goldsmith Anecdote (R. W. Chapman), p. 474.

— June 20—

John Skelton, pp. 481-82.

"The Cockles of the Heart" (George Milne), p. 494.

Suggested derivation.

Milton's "Treason" (Bernard A. Wright), p. 494.

Note on *Paradise Lost*, I. 594 seq.

R. Jones's "Christmas Carolles" (Edward B. Reed), p. 494.

— June 27—

Dr. Johnson's Lichfield Origins (A. L. Reade), p. 514.

Sir William Temple the Elder (G. C. Moore Smith), p. 514.

"Betrenched" (J. Anderson Smith), p. 514.

Use by Quarles.

Johnson's Dictionary.

Proposed edition in parts. Reply by J. Gordon Hayes, July 11, p. 558.

— July 4—

Visits of Professional Players to Abingdon, 1558-1587 (F. S. Boas), p. 535.

Bishop Percy and the Scottish Ballads (P. G. Thomas), p. 538.

Help given by Sir David Dalrymple. Further notes by Marjorie Williams and Ingpen and Stonehill, July 11, p. 558; by P. G. Thomas, July 25, p. 592.

Sir Walter Scott on Harriette Wilson's Memoirs (T. Cyprian Williams), p. 538.

Two Notes on Keats (William Soutar), p. 538.

On Leaving Some Friends . . . and Great Spirits now on Earth . . .

Shakespeare's Coat of Arms (S. A. Tannenbaum), p. 538.

Date of grant. Reply by D. P. Barton, July 11, p. 558.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, July 11—

Triglyph and Tristram (J. M. S. Tompkins), p. 558.
Meeting of Sterne and Richard Griffith.

———— July 18—

English Sculpture in English Literature, pp. 565-66.

Pepys's "Cousin Mark" (Walter H. Whitear), p. 576.

"The Devil of a Duke" (Burns Martin), p. 576.

Evidence of Ramsay's authorship of additional songs.

———— July 25—

William Collins (Edmund Blunden), p. 592.

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1929

B.A. with Honours in English Language and Literature.

BELFAST.—English Literature :

Class II.—Mary Leith, Mary F. O'Friel, R. H. Rainey, M. W. M. Welland.

Class III.—Mary Brown, Dinah Hogg.

BIRMINGHAM.—English :

Class I.—A. Campbell, Gertrude M. Davies.

Class II.—Kathleen M. Bedington, J. F. G. Bloomer, A. J. Cogbill, Barbara M. Cole, Bernice M. A. Edge, Lilian V. Highfield, Dorothy Hodges, Ida M. Holloway, Beatrice O. Johnson, Inez P. Johnson, Kathleen G. Jones, G. T. Lloyd, Adela M. Lock, Ivy M. P. Matthews, Muriel Rigsby, Irene W. M. Spencer, Katharine A. Swift, F. R. Treadgold, Norah W. Wilde, Dorothy M. Willison.

Class III.—Phyllis C. M. Davis, C. Hand, G. H. Northing, Catherine M. W. Shedden, Annie L. Smith.

Classified on completion of subsidiary requirements.

Class II.—Hilda M. Deacon, F. Kitson.

BRISTOL.—English :

Class I.—Isabel M. Swayne.

Class II.—*Div. 1* : Hilda E. Alder-Barrett, R. G. J. Allen, Evelyn G. Fiford, C. F. Fisher, A. G. Gardner, *Div. 2* : Kathleen M. Fitzhenry, Christabel F. Forsbrook, Audrey O. E. Horsell, Frances W. Maggs, A. G. Ringwood, Winifred R. Trobridge.

Class III.—A. L. Hale.

CAMBRIDGE.—English Tripos :

Class I.—T. K. Barrett (Trin.), A. Cooke (Jes.), *W. Empson (Ds.) (Magd.), W. Laing (Pemb.), W. Moore (Pemb.), R. C. R. Morrell (Pet.), J. D. Neil (Pemb.), F. Y. Thompson (Cath.).

Class II.—*Div. 1* : K. Bumstead (Emm.), E. Chitty (Jes.), R. H. L. Cohen (King's), H. Coombes (Queens'), H. C. Franklin (Cath.), W. Godfrey (Jes.), C. A. Hackett (Emm.), B. E. Hussey (Down.), R. T. King (Trin. H.), A. F. Scott (Emm.), M. C. F. Smith (Joh.), A. D. H. Thompson (Joh.), G. M. Turnell (Corp. Chr.), F. J. B. Watson (Joh.), W. A. Westrup (Christ's). *Div. 2* : J. H. Boatman (Joh.), R. H. Brown (Cai.),

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1929 507

J. D. Carsley (Selw.), R. T. Child (Selw.), G. H. Clayton (Selw.), E. A. Crutchley (Trin. H.), J. de Blank (Queens'), F. A. Fawns (Jes.), J. W. Fisher (Emm.), J. B. Gardner (Joh.), M. S. Gordon (Trin.), M. Hidayetullah (Trin.), C. B. Hogan (Corp. Chr.), D. B. J. Kensit (non-coll.), O. J. Key (Pet.), A. N. Lancaster (Selw.), J. Mascaro (Down.), H. W. A. Maxwell (Trin.), W. A. Nicholls (Emm.), F. B. Pinion (non-coll.), F. S. Pitt (King's), J. E. Shepherd (Magd.), A. J. L. Southwell (Down.), W. S. Spencer (Emm.), K. S. Tayler (Down.), L. Watson (Sid. Suss.), H. F. H. Whitfield (non-coll.), R. D. Whittingham (Pet.), G. W. Yates (King's).

Class III.—O. K. de la T. Berry (Joh.), H. Bilsby (Joh.), G. Bruce (Joh.), D. G. Chambers (Cai.), K. J. Collins (Cath.), N. F. Colyer (Jes.), D. Crichton-Miller (Pemb.), K. D. Crook (Selw.), J. N. G. Davidson (Cath.), F. E. F. Doubleday (Pemb.), J. A. Ewart (Jes.), A. R. Gibbs (non-coll.), J. T. M. Gibson (Sid. Suss.), W. M. Gradon (Christ's), J. N. Grange-Bennett (Christ's), O. P. Gunning (Trin.), C. W. E. Hassé (King's), A. W. Hastings (Trin. H.), D. Hay (Joh.), F. Kesteven (Jes.), R. V. Machell (Trin.), A. Mazower (Corp. Chr.), P. S. Montgomery (Trin.), F. B. Newbould (Trin.), J. E. Newsome (Queens'), C. J. Saltmarshe (Magd.), A. H. Seymour-Lucas (Pet.), M. V. Sims Williams (Trin. H.), K. M. Stobart (Pemb.), G. Wilson (Joh.), T. C. Worsley (Joh.).

WOMEN

Class I.—*M. C. Bradbrook (Girton), M. R. Lyne (Newnham).

Class II.—Div. 1:—H. Gray (Newn.), T. R. Johnson (Newn.), E. B. Mitchell (Girton), N. Owen (Girton), F. M. Picot (Girton), E. M. Sheard (Girton), R. Simpson (Newn.). *Div. 2:* E. B. J. Beith (Girton), A. B. Brown (Girton), F. M. Bull (Newn.), D. J. Howden (Girton), N. G. Hussey (Newn.), E. Jukes (Girton), M. Napier (Newn.), S. Peters (Girton), S. M. V. Sadlier (Newn.), P. N. Thornton (Newn.), G. M. Tunnichiffe (Newn.).

Class III.—D. R. Cohen (Newn.), M. M. Little (Girton), M. A. M. Matthews (Girton).

PART II, 1929

Class I.—E. W. Allam (King's), F. J. R. Bottrall (Pemb.), L. Clarke (Christ's), A. C. Frost (Cla.), *F. H. S. Jennings (Pemb.), *G. W. Rossetti (Cai.), J. C. Thornton (Corp. Chr.), *T. H. White (Queens').

Class II.—Div. 1: S. E. Aldridge (Down.), J. R. Blenkinsop (Joh.), R. G. Eberhart (Joh.), E. J. Frank (Ds.) (Jes.), W. F. Hare (Magd.), J. A. Kay (Down.), G. Reavey (Cai.). *Div. 2:* D. J. N. Flower (King's), R. I. Gannon (Christ's), J. A. Jerome (Emm.), J. E. Jewell (Trin. H.), P. A. C. Ketchum (Emm.), J. W. Skillington (non-coll.), J. L. Sweeney (Magd.).

Class III.—V. J. Brown (Christ's), D. L. Graham (Jes.), B. Hallahan (Trin. H.), R. Horrox (Christ's), K. M. Mayall (Corp. Chr.).

An asterisk denotes distinction.

WOMEN

Class I.—M. L. Crawford (Newn.), S. G. Fry (Newn.), *E. E. Phare (Newn.).

Class II.—*Div. 1* : Z. L. Caplan (Newn.), U. K. N. Carter (Newn.), G. Freeman (Girton), A. M. Henderson (Newn.), E. E. Hurst (Newn.), J. E. Morwood (Girton), B. M. Nixon (Newn.), L. Peters (Girton), L. J. Pickles (Newn.), K. M. Whiting (Girton). *Div. 2* : D. A. H. Buck (Newn.), S. Cockayne (Newn.), M. C. Coss (Newn.), S. E. De Wet (Newn.), E. M. Furtado (Newn.), D. M. Hutchinson (Newn.), W. E. Midgley (Girton), P. Royston (Girton), K. M. Watts (Girton).

Class III.—I. S. R. Drummond (Girton), L. V. Morgan-Browne (Girton).

An asterisk denotes distinction.

DURHAM.—English Language and Literature :

Class II.—E. L. Ableson (Bede), A. R. Atkinson (Hatf.), Olive Beveridge (St. Mary's), R. Calder (Bede), S. M. Day (Bede), Even Finlay (Arms.), J. J. Gourlay (Arms.), Phyllis H. Hubie (St. Hild's), Jean T. Leathard (St. Hild's), S. Norman (Arms.), B. Pattison (Arms.), Vivienne N. Philpott (Arms.), Edith A. Richardson (St. Hild's), B. T. W. Stevenson (Arms.), Euphemia F. Stuart (St. Mary's), Katherine J. Widdows (Arms.).

Class III.—Winifred M. A. Atherley (Home), Kathleen M. Bell (Neville's X), Margaret T. Brown (St. Mary's), W. G. Warner (Hatf.).

LEEDS.—English :

Class I.—Freda G. Peace, Bertha Thompson.

Class II.—Agnes Clark, F. V. Davey, Mary Eaton, C. Jackson, H. Jackson, Mildred B. Jackson, Myra S. Johnson, J. B. Long, Hilda Peers, Isabel W. Potts.

Class III.—Mabel Robinson, Maggie Schofield.

LIVERPOOL.—English :

Part I.—R. Baron, R. Boote, Dorothy E. Brook, Phyllis Clarke, Grace M. Dagg, Florence M. Davies, Alice Eden, Constance G. Haigh, Margaret Haslam, Winifred L. Heap, Eileen E. Parker, A. J. Smith, Mary D. Wilson.

Part II (Modern English Literature) :

Class II.—*Div. 1* : Kathleen Corrigan, Ellen E. Foley, P. A. Gaskill, G. G. Hough, Gertude M. Mitchell, Wilhelmina Morrissey, Mary E. Nichols, Amy E. G. Sephton, G. A. Topp. *Div. 2* : Margaret M. Byrne, Ellen A. Howard, Dorothy Inglis, Muriel Smalley, Katie Smethurst, H. Towers, Mary Wallhouse, Lily D. Whiteley.

Part II (Mediæval English Literature) :

Class II.—*Div. 1* : Emma C. J. Price.

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1929 509

LONDON (Internal).—English :

Class I.—Dorothy L. A. Hayes (Bedford), Joyce McMullon (King's), W. T. C. Sharp (King's), S. G. West (King's).

Class II.—*Div. 1:* S. H. Atkins (King's), Evelyn M. Attwood (Bedford), Kathleen M. Caldin (Holloway), F. L. Clark (King's), Nancy Clark (U. C.), Enid A. Dickie (Birkbeck), Viola M. Ekins (King's), Stella W. Eldridge (Bedford), R. A. Gillanders (U. C.), P. J. Irwin (Birkbeck), W. Matthews (Birkbeck), Laura R. Ringer (King's), Norah Seago (U. C.), Audry D. R. Smith (King's), P. G. Smith (U. C.), Dorothy F. Wallace (Westfield), Sybil Walton (King's), Felicia M. Whitefoot (Holloway), Nancy M. T. Whiteley (Holloway), Helen M. Wilks (E. L. C.), May I. Willcox (King's).

Class II.—*Div. 2 :* Yerta E. Alexander (U. C.), Monica Auckland (Holloway), Kathleen M. Balfern (Birkbeck), J. N. Britton (U. C.), Gertrude M. Buckworth (U. C.), Winifred J. Chalk (Holloway), D. C. Collins (King's), G. W. Cook (King's), Ethel L. Cosgrove (King's), Julia M. Cronin (Bedford), Winefride M. Curran (Bedford), Olive I. Dolman (Westfield), Margaret Dowling (U. C.), Beatrice V. D. Evans (Westfield), Doris G. Fisher (Holloway), Joan M. Gladstone (U. C.), Joan G. Gooding (Birkbeck), Eva C. Greenfield (King's), Phæbe M. Gregory (King's), Cecily J. Hesmondhalgh (Westfield), Helen M. Howse (King's), Margaret Hunt (Bedford), Ella M. Izod (King's), Margaret Johnson (King's), Marjorie H. Jones (Bedford), Daphne C. D. Macpherson (U. C.), Patricia M. May (Westfield), Gertrude D. Millican (Holloway), Kathleen M. Monson (Bedford), Janet M. Morrell (Holloway), Gwyneth E. Morris (Bedford), J. Nelson (King's), A. J. P. Puddephatt (King's), G. H. Roberts (King's), Dorothy M. Robinson (Bedford), Muriel Rush (Bedford), Nancie D. Sharman (King's), W. A. Simpson (King's), Ada Skipsey (U. C.), R. Steele (U. C.), Gladys Amy Taylor (Bedford), W. W. Thomas (U. C.), Norah G. Veillard (King's), Ellaline A. Weaving (King's), Gwyneth A. Wise (Holloway), Lilian R. Woodall (King's), Dorothy Wright (King's), May J. Wyatt (King's), Olive E. B. Youngs (Westfield).

Class III.—R. I. Adkins (U. C.), A. A. Advani (U. C.), Kathleen M. Bradbury (U. C.), Marjorie M. Buckman (Bedford), Mary E. Churchill (King's), Grace M. P. Daly (King's), Olive E. Golding (E. L. C.), Rina J. Hands (E. L. C.), Marjorie T. Hankin (Westfield), Margaret M. Hicks (Bedford), W. Horgan (King's), Kusum Jayavant (Westfield), Marjorie Morley (King's), L. N. Moule (U. C.), Olive M. O'Kane (Bedford), C. E. Owen (U. C.), Karenza M. Pollitt (Holloway), Elizabeth S. Ruff (Bedford), Muriel G. Sherrard (Westfield), Gwendolen M. Smith (Westfield), Enid P. Wagstaffe (Holloway), Jessie Wilson (Holloway), Mary J. Wolverson (Bedford).

LONDON (External).—English :

Class I.—G. F. Cunningham (Priv.), W. N. Dixon (Priv.), I. W. J. Machin (Portsmouth Municipal College), G. P. Meikle (Priv.), S. R. J. Morris (U. C. South.), A. H. Stewart (U. C. Nott.), Elsie P. Ward (Priv.).

Class II.—Div. 1 : A. J. W. Beal (Borough Rd. Coll.), G. S. Boulton (Portsm. M. C.), Gladys M. Cook (Portsm. M. C.), W. Cranwell (Coll. of St. Mark and St. John), L. J. Goodburn (Westminster Coll.), Joyce Gow (Priv.), Vera H. Howes (Portsm. M. C.), Olwen P. Jones (U. C. Nott.), W. H. Mason (Priv.), C. J. C. Nairne (Priv.), J. E. W. Percival (U. C. South.), Louisa E. Pike (Priv.). *Div. 2 :* F. Akehurst (Coll. of St. Mark and St. John), Vera Alger (U. C. Ex.), Florence I. R. Barber (Portsm. M. C.), Kathleen E. Barrand (Univ. of Reading), A. Bennett (Priv.), Constance Bennett (U. C. Leicester), A. H. Body (Priv.), Nora E. Bridge (U. C. Ex.), Julia Carter (Univ. of Reading), Winifred G. Derry (Priv.), Constance M. Errington (U. C. Nott.), L. A. Fitzgerald (Priv.), Alice M. Guy (Priv.), G. C. Jones (Priv.), W. G. Lawson (Chester Coll.), D. S. Lidbury (Priv.), Alice B. I. Maxwell (U. C. Nott.), H. Morland (Coll. of St. Mark and St. John), Irene Oesterley (Priv.), Gwladys J. R. Phillips (U. C. South.), T. Seabridge (Priv.), K. S. Spreadbury (U. C. Ex.), F. J. Stone (Portsm. M. C.), Dorothy M. White (Priv.), G. H. M. Williams (Borough Rd. Coll.).

*Class III.—*W. J. Battersby (Priv.), Edith M. Bulman (U. C., Leicester), Ethel M. K. Church (U. C. Ex.), R. J. Cook (U. C. Nott.), B. L. Cronin (Priv.), D. A. Davey (U. C. Ex.), G. H. Gwinnell (Univ. of Edin.), Gwendoline M. Hiscocks (King's), W. E. Mitchell (Priv.), Nellie M. Moore (U. C. Ex.), J. R. N. Moss (U. C. Ex.), E. C. Murray (Priv.), Nellie Parker (U. C. South.), Mary L. C. Roberts (Priv.), Dorothy M. Smith (Priv.), J. E. Timms (Priv.), Minnie Vennell (Priv.), Eileen M. Wildish (Priv.), Jessie E. M. Wilson (Priv.).

MANCHESTER.—English Language and Literature :

*Class I.—*Enid Wright.

Class II.—Div. 1 : J. L. Bilsborrow, Joan Chettle, Nancy M. Cridlan, Kathleen H. Culshaw, Emily M. Gaskins, Lucy M. Green, A. L. Hamwee, J. M. Henthorn, Honor G. Hotchin, Elizabeth H. Johnson, Grace Robins, D. Summerfield, Enid K. Swire, Phyllis P. Thornton, N. Whitton. *Div. 2 :* J. E. Lindsay, Bridgid M. McSweeney, Doreen A. Nice, Kathleen F. Ross, Mildred Willson.

*Class III.—*Edith Ashworth, Doris M. Clegg, Elizabeth R. Mackay, C. W. Pownall, Gwendoline A. M. Saxton.

OXFORD.—English Language and Literature :

*Class I.—*R. P. Fleming (Ch. Ch.), O. E. Holloway (Ball.), F. W. W. Rhodes (Hertf.), A. S. C. Ross (Ball.); Margery J. H. Clay (Som.), Helen L. Gardner (St. Hild.).

*Class II.—*D. F. Aitken (Ball.), R. L. Arrowsmith (Oriol), A. Bagshaw (Queen's), A. L. Binney (Ch. Ch.), J. Burnham (Ball.), F. Correia-Afonso (non-coll.), A. R. Griffiths (Magd.), N. B. Hammand (Mert.), T. C. Heritage (St. Edm. Hall), K. A. Muir (St. Edm. Hall), J. V. Shelby (Exeter), J. M. Stokes (Worc.), G. W. C. Thomas (Keble), A. D. B. Wood (Magd.); Felicia H. Browne (St. Hild.), Nancy G. Burge (Som.), Eliza O. Carter (H.-S.), Margaret S. Coltart (H.-S.), Mavis M. Hill (Som.), Elizabeth E.

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1929 511

McLellan (H.-S.), Agnes J. W. Newbigin (Som.), Margaret M. Scott (Som.), Marjorie Sherlock (St. Hug.), Rachel M. Thorpe (H.-S.).

Class III.—E. G. Ashford (Wadh.), E. Bacon (Keble), W. H. Berridge (Wadh.), R. W. Britton (St. Edm. Hall), S. M. Chanda (non-coll.), J. W. Chase (Mert.), E. C. E. De Peyer (Magd.), K. J. Dickens (Keble), G. W. St. J. Edwards (non-coll.), E. T. Foster (Exeter), G. H. Gretton (Ball.), R. H. Hull (Worc.), W. Johnson (St. Edm. Hall), H. D. B. Jones (Jesus), J. A. Lucas (Keble), C. V. Mahajan (Keble), I. H. D. Megarry (Trin.), C. J. Oppen (Jesus), C. J. Peacock (Oriol), C. J. Reynolds (Wadh.), H. J. Russell (Univ.), G. Sims (non-coll.), H. N. G. Thompson (New.), H. R. Watts (non-coll.), L. Wilmerding (Queen's); Josephine M. Bain (St. Hild.), Monica Beare (H.-S.), Ursula Charnock Smith (H.-S.), Kathleen M. Creswell (H.-S.), Helen Dixon (St. Hug.), Grace M. Ervine (St. Hug.), Eleanor L. Evans (St. Hild.), Rachel Floyd (Som.), Lucie J. Freeman (L. M. H.), Eunice E. Gomez (H.-S.), Catharine M. Gray (St. Hug.), Mary C. Harrison (H.-S.), Marjorie R. Heaslip (Som.), Muriel James (St. Hug.), Winifred Knox (St. Hug.), Joyce M. Lawson (L. M. H.), Margaret Lord (St. Hild.), Miriam V. Lovelock (Som.), Margaret L. MacDonald (L. M. H.), Edith K. Milner (St. Hug.), Anastasia O'Brien (H.-S.), Mary C. Owen (St. Hug.), Sita A. Ram (H.-S.), Cecily V. Rawson Briggs (H.-S.), Winifred E. Shepherd (St. Hug.), Alice G. Smith (H.-S.), Viola H. C. Stirling (L. M. H.), Sheila F. M. Taylor (H.-S.), Mary N. Tucker (H.-S.), Margaret H. Vesey (Som.), Barbara Watts (St. Hug.).

Class IV.—D. L. Bird (St. Edm. Hall), W. V. Brelsford (St. Edm. Hall), R. L. Cook (Exeter), K. M. Hosain (Exeter), O. T. Jenkins (Ball.), E. G. Swann (Pemb.), C. G. Webb-Harris (non-coll.), R. G. S. Whitfield (Mert.), E. Williams (Jesus), R. Wooldridge (Wadh.); Eira B. Badcock (Som.), Dorothy B. Bond (St. Hug.), Rosina M. Campbell (St. Hug.), Dorothea J. Hicks (H.-S.), Alice M. Littlewood (L. M. H.), Margaret J. Mackintosh (St. Hild.), Helen T. McMahon (H.-S.), Beatrice M. O'Donnell (H.-S.), Bessie Whittaker (L. M. H.).

Overstanding, satisfied the Examiners.—H. M. Ainger (Hertf.).

SHEFFIELD.—English :

Class II.—*Div. 1* : Mary Carty, Daphne S. Robinson, Enid Robinson, E. R. Seary. *Div. 2* : Olive M. Brown, Bessie Line, Edna M. White, Dorothy Wilson.

Class III.—J. Coupe, Janet K. Loram.

WALES.—English :

Class I.—L. Bernstein (Card.), J. E. Brown (Aber.), B. G. Charles (Aber.), D. W. Clarke (Swan.), Edith Davies (Card.), Nancy E. Everson (Aber.), Anne Francis (Aber.), D. J. V. Leadbeater (Aber.), E. Thomas (Card.).

Class II.—*Div. 1* : T. H. Bowen (Aber.), Bridget Downing (Aber.), Kathleen M. Edwards (Card.), Glenys S. Evans (Card.), G. B. Griffiths (Swan.), W. J. J. Gubb (Card.), Constance M. Hoskin (Swan.), Ethel N.

Hughes (Aber.), Elizabeth M. Jenkins (Aber.), R. S. T. John (Card.), Elizabeth R. Jones (Aber.), Gwladys E. E. Jones (Card.), Myra Morgan (Aber.), H. Pepperell (Card.), Ethel M. Pryde (Ban.), D. A. P. Saunders (Card.), Enid Walker (Swan.), W. J. Warburton (Card.), B. C. Williams (Card.). *Class II.—Div. 2*: Edith U. Adams (Aber.), Kathleen I. Brown (Ban.), Annie Davies (Aber.), C. G. Davies (Swan.), Maggie E. Davies (Card.), W. G. Evans (Card.), Noreen M. S. Folland (Card.), W. A. Freeman (Card.), Lillian M. Hotchkiss (Card.), Millicent Jenkins (Card.), Enid M. John (Card.), Doris M. Mees (Card.), Nansi J. R. Morgan-Morris (Card.), Dilys Parry (Card.), Mary O. Rowe (Swan.), Irene Samuel (Aber.), Cecilia E. Smith (Aber.).

Class III.—Sarah A. Beynon (Swan.), F. H. Cleaver (Aber.), Martha H. Griffiths (Aber.), G. H. Jones (Aber.).

SCOTLAND (M.A.)

ABERDEEN.—English:

Class I.—A. D. Adam, E. M. Duncan, R. Kemp, Eileen M. McKilligin, Marian B. Milne, W. A. Rutherford.

Class II.—N. A. Cameron, Jean Mackie, N. J. Pirie, J. Ross, Meta Strachan, J. S. L. Wood.

EDINBURGH.—English:

Class I.—Elizabeth A. M'C. Dougary, J. H. Hood, D. G. Ramage, Janet M. Smith, C. E. Wright.

Class II.—Eleanor O. Armstrong, J. B. Baxter, D. L. Blair, P. W. Cairns, Evelyn E. Corrie, Annie Dingwall, Honora M'F. Duffy, Elizabeth M. Fraser, Mary L. Gilbert, D. J. M. Irving, Mary O. Linton, Katherine C. MacArthur, Agnes G. M'Clure, Dorothy Q. M'Gill, Ethel M. Mabbott, Jane M. Mowat, J. K. Orr, Ina Pitt, Jessie M'A. Scotland, J. P. Smith, Janet D. B. Taylor, J. Watson.

ERRATUM

P. 358, l. 18. The reference to Professor Wolfgang Keller was based (happily) on an error, for the diffusion of which both we and the writer sincerely apologise. The learned editor of the *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* is still with us. May he long be spared to continue his valuable contributions to English scholarship!

INDEX

- Addison, Joseph, his share in *The Tatler*, 155 ; R. P. Bond on a Fragment by him, 203
- Ainsworth, O. M., his *Milton on Education* reviewed, 480
- Alexander*. See *Wars of Alexander*.
- Allen, Edward, and P. Henslowe's will, 308
- Allen, Hope Emily, her *Writings ascribed to Richard Rolle* reviewed, 79
- Anderson, Ruth L., her *Elizabethan Psychology and Shakespeare's Plays* reviewed, 474
- Andrew, S. O., article on *Huchoun's Works*, 12 ; on the *Wars of Alexander and Destruction of Troy*, 267 ; on *The Preterite in North-Western Dialects*, 431
- Anglo-Saxon : a Semantic Study*, article by Kemp Malone, 173
- Anglo-Saxon Eleventh-Century Crisis, The*, article by Aldo Ricci, 1
- Anglo-Saxon Poetry, The Chronology of*, article by Aldo Ricci, 257
- Anglo-Saxon, note on two passages of O.E. verse by M. Ashdown, 324
- Arcana Aulica*, 1652, 143
- Ascham, R., Bennet's edition of, note by R. W. C., 69
- Ashdown, M., note on two passages of O.E. verse, 324
- Ault, Norman, his *Seventeenth Century Lyrics* reviewed, 112
- Autographs, Early Literary*, Pt. II, ed. W. W. Greg, reviewed, 472
- Avontyrs of Arthur*, dialect of, 14 ; authorship, 16
- B., E. C., review by, 486
- Baker, Ernest A., reviews by, 235, 365
- Baldwin, T. W., and Massinger's *Emperor of the East*, 41
- Ballads, Folklore in, 493
- Banks, Theodore H., jr., his ed. of Denham's *Poetical Works* reviewed, 232
- Barclay, Alexander, The Eclogues of*, ed. B. White, reviewed, 467
- Barnicle, Mary E., her edition of *The Seege or Batayle of Troye* reviewed, 461
- Bateson, F. W., article on the *Errata in The Tatler*, 155 ; review by, 482
- Batho, E. C., reviews by, 209, 247
- Beckford, William, *La Jeunesse de, et la Genèse de son "Vathek,"* par M. May, reviewed, 235
- Bellay, Joachim du, and Sir T. Browne, note by H. G. Ward, 59
- Belle's Stratagem, The*, article by R. Crompton Rhodes, 129
- Bennett, H. S., reviews by, 119, 207, 467
- Bennet, James, his ed. of Ascham, 69
- Beowulf and Epic Tradition*, by W. W. Lawrence, reviewed, 333
- Bibliography, An Introduction to, for Literary Students*, by R. B. McKerrrow, reviewed, 121
- Bibliography, Practical, Enumerative, Historical*, by H. B. van Hoesen and F. K. Walter, reviewed, 493
- Bibliography of Writings in the English Language*, by A. G. Kennedy, noticed, 120
- Blackman, Elsie, review by, 333
- Blake, W., his *Poetical Sketches*, introduced by Jack Lindsay, reviewed, 364
- Blunden, E., his edition of Leigh Hunt's *Autobiography* noticed, 498
- Boas, F. S., his *Year's Work in English Studies*, Vol. VIII, noticed, 497
- Boccaccio, G., his influence on Hawes' *Pastime of Pleasure*, note by C. W. Lemmi, 195
- Boethius : de Consolatione Philosophiæ*, ed. M. Science, reviewed, 341
- Bond, Richmond P., note on *A Fragment by Addison*, 203
- Bonnard, G. A., note on Carlyle's letter to A. Vinet, 70 ; on *Troilus and Criseyde*, 323
- Boutell, H. S., his *First Editions of To-day and how to tell them* noticed, 376

- Bradley, Henry, *The Collected Papers of*, reviewed, 371
- Braun, Fritz, his edition of *Briefe von R. Rask an J. H. Halbertsma* noticed, 496
- Brett-Smith, H. F. B., letter on *The Works of Etherege*, 77; review by, 224; his *Selections from T. L. Peacock* noticed, 367
- Bridges, Robert, *Collected Essays of*, II-III, noticed, 376; his *Memoir of Henry Bradley* noticed, 371
- Brinkley, Roberta Florence, her *Nathan Field* reviewed, 108
- Brook Farm, *Letters from*, by M. Dwight, ed. A. L. Reed, noticed, 497
- Brown, Beatrice Daw, her edition of *The Southern Passion* reviewed, 453
- Browne, Sir T., and Joachim du Bellay, 59; his *Christian Morals*, ed. S. C. Roberts, reviewed, 218
- Brunanburh, *Battle of*, ll. 11-13, 324
- Buck, H. Swazey, his *Smollett as Poet* reviewed, 359
- Buckhurst, H. T. McM., reviews by, 339, 341, 453, 461
- Bullock, Constance, article on *The Enemies of Man*, 186
- Burch, Charles Eaton, note on Defoe and the *Edinburgh Courant*, 437
- Butler, Samuel, *Satires and Miscellaneous Poetry and Prose*, ed. René Lamar, reviewed, 479
- Byrne, M. St. C., review by, 342
- C., A. M., review by, 477
- C., R. W., note on Bennet's *Ascham*, 69; review by, 367
- C., S., his *Art of Complaisance*, 1673, 149
- Capell, E., note on the date of his *Notes to Shakespeare*, Vol. ii, by G. C. Taylor, 317
- Carbonnières, Ramond de, *Grosley and Mrs. Radcliffe*, article by J. M. S. Tompkins, 294
- Carey, Henry, and *The Disappointment*, 66; and *A Learned Dissertation on Dumpling*, 442
- Carlyle, Thomas, note on his letter to A. Vinet by G. A. Bonnard, 70
- Carver, P. L., note on A Criticism of Pope's "Moonlight Scene" in the *Quarterly Review*, 441; review by, 367
- Catullian Influence in English Lyric Poetry, c. 1600-1650, by J. B. Emperor, reviewed, 478
- Census of British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1620-1800, by R. S. Crane and F. B. Kaye, reviewed, 241
- Centlivre, Mrs., and Henry Carey, 66
- Chambers, Sir E. K., reviews by, 103, 465
- Chapman, J. A., his *Papers on Shelley, Wordsworth and Others* reviewed, 491
- Chapman, R. W., his edition of *Rasselas* noticed, 363
- Chaucer, G., note on his *Troilus and Criseyde*, by G. Bonnard, 323; *Geoffrey Chaucers Kleinere Dichtungen*, ed. J. Koch, reviewed, 336; *Die Funktionen des Erzählers in Chaucers Epischer Dichtung*, by H. Lüdeke, reviewed, 463. See *Studien*.
- Cheke, Sir John, und der englische Humanismus, von W. L. Nathan, reviewed, 213
- Christ, *A Stanzaic Life of*, ed. F. A. Foster, reviewed, 339
- Chronology of Anglo-Saxon Poetry, *The*, article by Aldo Ricci, 257
- Cibber, Colley, *An Appreciation of*, by D. M. E. Habbema, reviewed, 229
- Clark, William S., note on Pordage's *Herod and Mariamme*, 61
- Clyde, W. M., review by, 221
- Coleridge, S. T., a note on Pope's imagery in *Biog. Lit.*, 441
- Commonwealth and Restoration Stage, *The*, by L. Hotson, reviewed, 221
- Congreve, William, his *Mourning Bride, etc.*, ed. B. Dobrée, noticed, 498
- Connes, George, his *Shakespeare Mystery* noticed, 246
- Constable, K. M., review by, 218
- Copleston, Edward, his *Advice to a Young Reviewer*, 375
- Courtier, *The*, and the *Bookseller: Some Vagaries of Seventeenth-Century Publishing*, article by W. Lee Ustick, 143
- Cowley, Hannah, article on her *Belle's Stratagem*, 129
- Cowper, William, notes on certain of his Letters and Poems, 167
- Crane, R. S., his *Census of Newspapers, 1620-1800*, reviewed, 241

- Crawford, S. J., review by, 243
 Cromwell, Otelia, her *Thomas Heywood*, reviewed, 477
 Cunningham, Peter, supposed forgeries in his *Revels Accounts*, 344
 Darbshire, Helen, reviews by, 114, 487
Darstellerzahl und Rollenverteilung bei Shakespeare, by Maria Sack, reviewed, 106
 Davis, Bernard E. C., review by, 364
 Day, Mabel, reviews by, 212, 336, 459, 463
 Defoe, Daniel, note on an unrecognized work of, by G. C. Moore Smith, 64; on his connections with the *Edinburgh Courant*, by C. E. Burch, 437; *D's Stellung zum englischen Kolonialwesen*, by H. Pollert, reviewed, 358, see p. 512
 Denham, Sir John, *The Poetical Works of*, ed. T. H. Banks, reviewed, 232; letter on, 332
Deor's Lament, ll. 18-19.. 326
Destruction of Troy, see *Wars of Alexander*.
 Dialects: see London, see North-Western, see Octavian.
Disappointment, The, note by F. T. Wood, 66
 Dobrée, Bonamy, his edition of Congreve's *Mourning Bride*, noticed, 498
 Dodds, A. E., review by, 491
 Dwight, Marianne, *Letters from Brook Farm*, noticed, 497
 Dyson, H. V. D., review by, 479
Early New England Pronunciation, by A. Orbeck, reviewed, 117
Edinburgh Courant, The, and Defoe, 437
 Edmonds, C. K., letter on "No wight in this world," 332
 Edwards, Richard, note by H. E. Rollins, 55
Elizabethan Journal, An, by G. B. Harrison, reviewed, 342
Elizabethan Psychology and Shakespeare's Plays, by R. L. Anderson, reviewed, 474
 Emperor, John B., his *Catullian Influence in English Lyric Poetry* reviewed, 478
Emperor of the East, The, whether revised by Massinger, 36
Enemies of Man, The, article by Constance Bullock, 186
 Engelen, Julia, and the original casting of Shakespeare's plays, 106
England from Wordsworth to Dickens, by R. W. King, noticed, 498
English Grammar, Some Important Points in Historical, by R. D.-N. Somerset, reviewed, 245
English Literary Autographs, Pt. II, ed. W. W. Greg, reviewed, 472
English Literature, The Sources of, by Arundell Esdaile, noticed, 374
English Vowels, Some Modern, article by A. H. Smith, 49
 Erasmus, D., note on a verse abridgement of his *de Pueris Instituendis*, by R. Pruvost, 306
Errata in the Tatler, The, article by F. W. Bateson, 155
 Esdaile, Arundell, his *Sources of English Literature* noticed, 374
 Etherage, Sir George, his *Letterbook*, ed. S. Rosenfeld, reviewed, 224; letter on *The Works of Etherage*, by H. F. B. Brett-Smith, 77
 Everett, Dorothy, reviews by, 79, 459
 Face-painting in Eliz. period, 312
 Field, Nathan, the *Actor-Playwright*, by R. F. Brinkley, reviewed, 108
First Editions of To-day and how to tell them, by H. S. Boutell, noticed, 376
 Fischer, Erna, her *Lautbestand des südmittelenglischen Octavians*, reviewed, 455
 Flower, Robin, review by, 472
Folklore in the English and Scottish Ballads, by L. C. Wimberley, reviewed, 492
 Forsythe, Robert S., his *Noble Rake* reviewed, 480
 Foster, Frances A., her ed. of *A Stanzaic Life of Christ* reviewed, 339
Fourfold Meditation, A, note on authorship of by H. J. L. Robbie, 200
Fresh Sources for Marlowe, article by Ethel Seaton, 385
 Fripp, Edgar I., his *Shakespeare's Stratford* reviewed, 476
 Furness, Horace H., jr., his ed. of *Coriolanus* reviewed, 215
 Garmonsway, G. N., his *Early Norse Reader* reviewed, 243
Gawain, Sir, and the Green Knight, notes on, by R. W. King, 449

- Goldsmith and the *Literary Magazine*, article by R. W. Seitz, 410
- Gordon, George, his edition of *Three Oxford Ironies* noticed, 375
- Grammar, *An Elementary Middle-English*, by J. and E. M. Wright, noticed, 246 : see *English Grammar*.
- Grattan, J. H. G., reviews by, 117, 473
- Greet, William Cabell, his ed. of *The Reule of Crysten Religioun* reviewed, 119
- Greg, W. W., his *English Literary Autographs*, Pt. II, reviewed, 472 ; reviews by, 106, 108, 344.
- Grosley, P. J., as a source of Mrs. Radcliffe's novels, 295
- H., G. B., reviews by, 246, 474
- H., H. R., notice by, 497
- Haas, C. E. de, his *Nature and the Country in English Poetry* reviewed, 486
- Habberna, D. M. E., his *Appreciation of Colley Cibber* reviewed, 229
- Hake, Edward, and Erasmus, 306
- Harrison, G. B., his *Elizabethan Journal* reviewed, 342 ; reviews by, 475, 476
- Havelok, ll. 164, 1129..328 ; ed. F. Holthausen, reviewed, 459
- Havens, R. D., note on *A Project of Wordsworth's* 320 ; on *Other Probationary Odes*, 447
- Hawes, S., his *Pastime of Pleasure* and *Boccaccio*, 195 ; *Pastime of Pleasure*, ed. W. E. Mead, reviewed, 207
- Henslowe's *Will* again, note by C. Sisson, 308
- Henslowe, John, and P. Henslowe's will, 308
- Herford, C. H., his *Year's Work in English Studies*, Vol. VIII, noticed, 497
- Herod and *Marianne*, S. Pordage's, 61
- Heywood, Thomas, by O. Cromwell, reviewed, 477
- Hicks, Edward, his *Sir Thomas Malory : his Turbulent Career* reviewed, 465
- Hoesen, Henry B. van, his *Bibliography* reviewed, 493
- Holthausen, F., his edition of *Havelok* reviewed, 459
- Hotson, Leslie, his *Commonwealth and Restoration Stage* reviewed, 221
- Howard, Philip, Earl of Arundel, author of *A Fourefold Meditation*, 200
- Huchoun's *Works*, article by S. O. Andrew, 12 ; the name Huchoun, 21
- Hunt, Leigh, his *Autobiography*, ed. E. Blunden, noticed, 498
- Hunter, Sir Mark, review by, 84
- Husbands, H. Winifred, *Summary of Periodical Literature*, 123, 248, 377, 497
- Hutchinson, F. E., review by, 110
- I have heard of your paintings too*, note by M. P. Tilley, 312
- Ignoramus and John Rhodes, 43 ; the translations by Parkhurst and Codrington, 44
- Ingram, E. G., reviews by, 245, 246
- Jeffreys, George, the *Merope* of, as a *Source of Voltaire's Merope*, by T. E. Oliver, reviewed, 484
- Jeunesse de William Beckford, La*, see *Beckford*.
- Johnson, Samuel, his *Rasselas*, ed. R. W. Chapman, noticed, 363
- Joyce, William, and certain English vowel-sounds, 49
- Kaye, F. B., his *Census of Newspapers, 1620-1800*, reviewed, 241
- Keats and Mary Tighe, ed. E. V. Weller, reviewed, 114
- Keats's *Shakespeare*, by C. F. E. Spurgeon, reviewed, 487
- Kennedy, Arthur G., his *Bibliography of Writings on the English Language* noticed, 120
- King, R. W., notes on *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, 449 ; his *England from Wordsworth to Dickens* noticed, 498
- Koch, Prof. J., his ed. of *G. Chaucers Kleinere Dichtungen* reviewed, 336
- Krog, Dr. Fritz, his *Studien zu Chaucer und Langland* reviewed, 212
- Lamar, René, his *Samuel Butler's Satires and Miscellaneous Poetry and Prose* reviewed, 479
- Lamb, C., note on an eighteenth-century original for his *Dissertation on Roast Pig*, by F. T. Wood, 442
- Landor, Robert Eyres, and *Selections from Robert Landor* by Eric Partridge, noticed, 247
- Langland : see *Studien*.
- Larg, D. G., article on *Henry Crabb Robinson and Madame de Staël*, 22 ; letter on Robinson, 331

- Lawrence, W. W., his *Beowulf and Epic Tradition* reviewed, 333
- Lemmi, C. W., note on Boccaccio's influence on Hawes' *Palace of Pleasure*, 195
- Lindsay, Jack, his ed. of Blake's *Poetical Sketches* reviewed, 364
- Literary Magazine, The*, and O. Goldsmith, 410
- Lloyd, L. J., a note on Skelton, 302
- London Dialect, The Early*, by B. A. Mackenzie, reviewed, 470
- Loomis, Gertrude Schoepperle, *Medieval Studies in Memory of*, reviewed, 103
- Lüdeke, H., his *Die Funktionen des Erzählers in Chaucers Epischer Dichtung* reviewed, 463
- Lyly, John, and the Office of the Revels, note by B. M. Ward, 57
- McIlwraith, A. K., article on *Did Massinger revise The Emperor of the East?* 36
- McK., R. B., reviews and notices by, 120, 363, 374, 485, 493, 497
- Mackail, J. W., his edition of *The Amber Witch* noticed, 376
- Mackenzie, Barbara A., her *Early London Dialect* reviewed, 470
- Mackenzie, Henry, his *Man of Feeling*, Scholartis Press ed., reviewed, 485
- McKerrow, R. B., his *Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students* reviewed, 121
- Malone, Kemp, article on the meanings of "Anglo-Saxon," 173
- Malory, Sir Thomas, his *Turbulent Career*, by E. Hicks, reviewed, 465
- Man of Feeling, The*, Scholartis Press ed., reviewed, 485
- Mansel, Henry, his *Phrontisterion*, 375
- Margoliouth, H. M., his edition of Andrew Marvell reviewed, 110
- Marlowe, C., article on *Fresh Sources for*, by Ethel Seaton, 385
- Marlowe, Robert Poley, and *the Tippings*, article by Ethel Seaton, 273
- Martin, L. C., his ed. of Nathaniel Wanley's Poems, reviewed, 219
- Marvell, Andrew, *The Poems and Letters of*, ed. H. M. Margoliouth, reviewed, 110
- Marx, Schweidler, the *Amber Witch*, ed. J. W. Mackail, noticed, 376
- Massinger, Philip, article on *Did Massinger revise The Emperor of the East?* by A. K. McIlwraith, 36
- May, Marcel, his *Jeunesse de William Beckford* reviewed, 235
- Mead, W. E., his edition of *The Pastime of Pleasure* reviewed, 207
- Mediæval Plays in Scotland*, by A. J. Mill, reviewed, 209
- Medieval Studies in Memory of Gertrude Schoepperle Loomis* reviewed, 103
- Merchant of Venice, The, and the Alien Question*, article by A. Tretiak, 402
- Merope*: see Jeffreys, George.
- Merritt, Percival, his *True Story of the so-called Love Letters of Mrs. Piozzi* reviewed, 362
- Merure, Le, de Sainte Eglise*, by Saint Edmund of Pontigny, and *Rolle's Devout Meditacioun*, ed. H. W. Robbins, reviewed, 457
- Miles, Hamish, his ed. of *The Man of Feeling* reviewed, 485
- Mill, Anna J., her *Mediæval Plays in Scotland* reviewed, 209
- Milton on Education*, by O. M. Ainsworth, reviewed, 480
- Mimms, North, and Sir T. More, 54
- Mohun, Charles, fourth Lord: see *Noble Rake*.
- Mönch, Der, in der Englischen Dichtung bis auf Lewis's "Monk,"* 1795, by R. Schneider, reviewed, 365
- More, Sir Thomas, and North Mimms, note by C. Sisson, 54
- Morley, Edith, J., on H. Crabb Robinson, 206
- Morte Arthure*, by the author of the *Avontyrs*, 16
- Murray, George, his (?) *Oxford Ars Poetica*, 375
- Nathan, Dr. W. L., his *Sir John Cheke* reviewed, 213
- Nature and the Country in English Poetry of the First Half of the Eighteenth Century*, by C. E. de Haas, reviewed, 486
- New England, Early Pronunciation in, 117
- Newspapers, Census of British, 1620-1800*, by R. S. Crane and F. B. Kaye, reviewed, 241
- Nicoll, Prof. Allardyce and *Ignoramus*, 43; and Pordage's *Herod and Mariamme*, 61

- "No wight in this world that wealth
can attain," note by H. E. Rollins, 56;
letter on, 332
- Noble Rake, A, The Life of Charles,
fourth Lord Mohun*, by R. S. Forsythe,
reviewed, 480
- Norfolk Place-Names, note on, 73
- Norse Reader, An Early*, by G. N.
Garmonsway reviewed, 243
- North-Western Dialects, The Preterite in*,
article by S. O. Andrew, 431
- Octavian, Der Lautbestand des südmittel-
englischen*, by E. Fischer, reviewed, 455
- Old English Verse, Note on two passages
of, by M. Ashdown, 324
- Old Scotch Songs and Poems*, ed. Sir J.
Wilson, reviewed, 473
- Oliver, Thomas E., his *Merope* of
*George Jeffreys as a source of Voltaire's
Merope* reviewed, 484
- Onions, C. T., note on *Havelok*, ll. 164,
1129..328
- Orbeck, Anders, his *Early New England
Pronunciation* reviewed, 117
- Orion*, by R. H. Horne, Scholartis
Press ed., reviewed, 367
- Oxford, The Seventeenth Earl of*, by
B. M. Ward, reviewed, 92
- Partridge, Eric, his *Robert Eyres Landor
and Selections from Robert Landor*
noticed, 247; his edition of R. H.
Horne's *Orion* reviewed, 367
- Pastime of Pleasure, The*: see Hawes, S.
- Peacock, T. L., *Selections from*, by
H. F. B. Brett-Smith noticed, 367
- Pecock, R., his *Reule of Crysten Reli-
gioun*, ed. W. C. Greet, reviewed, 119
- Pegg, an actress (1668), 45
- Periodical Literature: see *Summary*.
- Phillips, John, *The Poems of*, ed. M. G.
Lloyd Thomas, reviewed, 360
- Pinto, V. de S., reviews by, 112, 229, 360,
480
- Piozzi, Mrs., *The True Story of the
so-called Love Letters of*, by P.
Merritt, reviewed, 362
- Pistill of Susan*, dialect of, 12; author-
ship, 17
- Poley, Robert, and Marlowe, 273
- Pollert, H., his *Daniel Defoe's Stellung
zum englischen Kolonialwesen*, re-
viewed, 358: see p. 512.
- Pope, A., *The Dunciad*, Oxford type-
facsimile noticed, 376
- Pope, A., note on a criticism of his
"Moonlight Scene" in the *Quarterly
Review*, by P. L. Carver, 441
- Pordage, S., his *Herod and Mariamne*,
note by W. S. Clark on, 61
- Povey, Kenneth, notes on Cowper's
letters and poems, 167
- Powell, L. F., article on *George Steevens
and Isaac Reed's Biographia Drama-
tica*, 288; reviews by, 121, 241, 362
- Preterite, The, in North-Western Dialects*,
article by S. O. Andrew, 431
- Probationary Odes, Other*, note by
R. D. Havens, 447
- Pronunciation, Modern English, 49
- Pruvost, René, note on a verse abridge-
ment of Erasmus de Pueris Insti-
tuendis, 306
- Quarterly Review*, note on a criticism
of Pope in, 441
- Radcliffe, Mrs., sources of local colour
in her novels, 294
- Randall, J., and *The Disappointment*, 67
- Rask, R., *Briefe von, an J. H. Halbertsma
bearbeitet von F. Braun*, noticed, 496
- Rasselas, The History of*, ed. R. W.
Chapman, noticed, 363
- Reaney, Percy H., review by, 470
- Reed, A. W., review by, 371
- Reed, Amy L., her ed. of M. Dwight's
Letters noticed, 497
- Reed, Isaac, George Steevens and his
Biographia Dramatica, 288
- Refuge, E. de, translations of his *Traité
de la Cour*, 144
- Reule of Crysten Religioun, The*, ed.
W. C. Greet, reviewed, 119
- Revels, Office of the, John Lyly and the,
57; supposed forgeries in Cunning-
ham's *Revels Accounts*, 344
- Rhodes, R. Crompton, article on *The
Belle's Stratagem*, 129; his Sheridan's
Plays and Poems reviewed, 482
- Rhodes, John, and Ignoramus, article by
B. M. Wagner, 43
- Ricci, Aldo, article on *The Anglo-Saxon
Eleventh-Century Crisis*, 1; article
on *The Chronology of Anglo-Saxon
Poetry*, 257
- Robbie, H. J. L., note on authorship of
A Fourefold Meditation, 200
- Robbins, H. W., his edition of *Le
Merure de Sainte Eglise and the
Devout Meditation*, reviewed, 457

- Roberts, S. C., his ed. of Browne's *Christian Morals* reviewed, 218
- Robinson, Henry Crabb, and *Madame de Staël*, article by D. G. Larg, 22; letter from E. J. Morley on, 206; reply by D. G. Larg, 331.
- Rolle, Richard, *Writings ascribed to*, ed. H. E. Allen, reviewed, 79; Rolle and the *Devout Meditation*, 457
- Rolliad, *The*, influence of, 447
- Rollins, Hyder E., note on Richard Edwards, 55; on "No wight in this world that wealth can attain," 56
- Rosenfeld, Sybil, her ed. of Etherege's *Letterbook* reviewed, 224
- Sack, Maria, her *Darstellerszahl und Rollenverteilung bei Shakespeare* reviewed, 106
- Sarrazin, G., and the chronology of A.S. poetry, 257
- Saurat, Denis, review by, 480
- Schelling, Felix E., his *Shakespeare and Demi-Science* reviewed, 475
- Schneider, Rudolph, his *Der Mönch in der Englischen Dichtung*, reviewed, 365
- Schram, O. K., note on Norfolk Place-Names, 73
- Science, M., his ed. of *Boethius de Consolatione Philosophiæ* reviewed, 341
- Scotch Songs and Poems, Old*, ed. Sir J. Wilson, reviewed, 473
- Seaton, Ethel, article on *Marlowe, Robert Poley and the Tippings*, 273; on *Fresh Sources for Marlowe*, 385
- Seege or Batayle of Troye, The*, ed. M. E. Barnicle, reviewed, 461
- Seitz, R. W., article on *Goldsmith and the Literary Magazine*, 410
- Serjeantson, Mary S., review by, 455
- Seventeenth Century Lyrics*, ed. Norman Ault, reviewed, 112
- Seventeenth-Century Publishing*, article on *Some Vagaries of*, 143
- Shakespeare, W., *The Merchant of Venice and the Alien Question*, article by A. Tretiak, 402; note on the Typography of the Act-Headings of the First Folio, by E. E. Willoughby, 198; note on *Hamlet*, III. i, 148. 312; date of Capell's *Notes and Various Readings*, 317; *The Tragedie of Coriolanus*, ed. H. H. Furness, jr., reviewed, 215; *Shakespeare and the Theatre* (Sh. Assoc.), reviewed, 84; M. Sack's *Darstellerszahl und Rollenverteilung bei Shakespeare* reviewed and compared with J. Engelen's papers in *Sh. Jahrbuch*, 106; *Shakespeare Mystery, The*, by G. Connes, noticed, 246; *Shakspeare Forgeries in the Revels Accounts*, by S. Tannenbaum, reviewed, 344; *Shakespeare and Demi-Science*, by F. E. Schelling, reviewed, 475; *Shakespeare's Stratford*, by E. I. Fripp, reviewed, 476; *Keats's Shakespeare*, by C. F. E. Spurgeon, reviewed, 487
- Shakespeare Association, 1925-1926, *Papers on Shakespeare and the Theatre*, reviewed, 84
- Shelley, Wordsworth, and Others, Papers on*, by J. A. Chapman, reviewed, 491
- Sheridan, R. B., his *Plays and Poems*, ed. R. Crompton Rhodes, reviewed, 482
- Sidgwick, F., review by, 492
- Sisson, C., note on Sir T. More and North Mimms, 54; on Henslowe's Will, 308
- Skelton, John, a note on (poems attributed to) by L. J. Lloyd, 302
- Smith, A. H., article on *Some Modern English Vowels*, 49
- Smith, G. C. Moore, note on an unrecognized work of Defoe, 64; on Superlative Adjectives formed from Substantives, 203; reviews by, 92, 213, 219, 232, 358, 478
- Smith, Nowell, letter on verses of Sir J. Denham, 332
- Smollett as Poet*, by H. S. Buck, reviewed, 359
- Some Modern English Vowels*, article by A. H. Smith, 49
- Some Notes on Cowper's Letters and Poems*, article by Kenneth Povey, 167
- Somerset, R. D-N., his *Important Points in Historical English Grammar* reviewed, 245
- Southern Passion, The*, ed. B. D. Brown, reviewed, 453
- Southey, R., his criticisms of Pope's "Moonlight Scene," 441
- Southwell, R., and *A Fourefold Meditation*, 200
- Spurgeon, Caroline F. E., her *Keats's Shakespeare* reviewed, 487

- Staël, Mme de, and Crabb Robinson, 22
 Stage: see *Commonwealth*.
 Stevens, George, and Isaac Reed's
Biographia Dramatica, article by
 L. F. Powell, 288
 Stibbard (place-name), note on, 73
Studia Neophilologica, noticed, 375
Studien zu Chaucer und Langland, von
 F. Krog, reviewed, 212
Summary of Periodical Literature, by
 H. Winifred Husbands, 123, 248,
 377, 499
 Superlative Adjectives formed from
 Substantives, note by G. C. Moore
 Smith, 203
 Tannenbaum, S., his *Shakspeare For-
 geries in the Revels Accounts*, reviewed,
 344
 Tatler, *The*, article on *The Errata in*, 155
 Taylor, George C., on date of vol. ii of
 Capell's *Notes to Shakespeare*, 317
 Testerton (place-name), note on, 73
 Thackeray, W. M., the historical back-
 ground of his *Henry Esmond*, 480
 Thomas, M. G. Lloyd, his ed. of the
 poems of John Phillips reviewed, 360
Three Oxford Ironies, ed. George
 Gordon, noticed, 375
 Tighe, Mary, and Keats, 114
 Tilley, M. P., note on face-painting in
 Eliz. period, 312
 Tipping (family) and Marlowe, 273
 Tompkins, J. M. S., article on *Ramond
 de Carbonnières*, Grosley and Mrs.
Radcliffe, 294
 Tretiak, Andrew, article on *The Mer-
 chant of Venice and the Alien Question*,
 402
 Troye: see *The Seege or Batayle of*.
 Two Norfolk Place-Names, note by
 O. K. Schram, 73
 University Examination Results, 1929,
 506
 Unwin, W., Cowper's letters to, 167
 Ustick, W. Lee, article on *The Courtier
 and the Bookseller*, 143
 Vinet, A., T. Carlyle's letter to, 70
 Voltaire, his *Méropé*: see *Jeffreys*.
 W., H., his *Accomplish'd Courtier*, 1658,
 146
 Wagner, Bernard M., article on *John
 Rhodes and Ignoramus*, 43
 Walter, Frank K., his *Bibliography*
 reviewed, 493
 Walsingham, Edward, his *Arcana
 Aulica*, 143
 Wanley, Nathaniel, his *Poems*, ed. L. C.
 Martin, reviewed, 219
 Ward, B. M., note on J. Lyly and the
 Revels Office, 57; his *Seventeenth
 Earl of Oxford* reviewed, 92
 Ward, H. G., on Joachim du Bellay and
 Sir T. Browne, 59
*Wars of Alexander and Destruction of
 Troy*, article by S. O. Andrew, 267
 Weller, Earle Vonard, his *Keats and
 Mary Tighe* reviewed, 114
 White, Beatrice, her edition of *The
 Eclogues of Alexander Barclay* re-
 viewed, 467
Wife Well Managed, A., 66
 Williams, Harold, review by, 359
 Willoughby, E. E., note on the Typo-
 graphy of the Act-Headings of the
 First Folio, 198
 Wilson, J. Dover, review by, 215
 Wimberley, Lowry C., his *Folklore in
 the English and Scottish Ballads*
 reviewed, 492
 Wood, Frederick T., note on *The Dis-
 appointment*, 66; on an Eighteenth-
 Century Original for Lamb? 442
 Wordsworth, W., note on *A Project of
 Wordsworth's*, by R. D. Havens, 320;
 see *Shelley*.
 Wright, H. G., reviews by, 484, 496
 Wright, J. and E. M., *An Element-
 ary Middle-English Grammar* by,
 noticed, 246
 Wyatt, Sir T., *An excellent Epitaffe of
 Sir T. W.*, 1542, 56
Year's Work in English Studies, The,
 Vol. VIII, ed. F. S. Boas and C. H.
 Herford, noticed, 497

8,
in
hy
na
C.
he
th
nd
of
nd
he
re-
o-
he
in
ids
is-
h-
of
o;
en-
oy,
of
he,
H.